arXiv:1601.04147v1 [cs.LO] 16 Jan 2016

Dynamic Games and Strategies

Norihiro Yamada
and
Samson Abramsky
norihiro.yamada@cs.ox.ac.uk
samson.abramsky@cs.ox.ac.uk
Department of Computer Science
University of Oxford

January 19, 2016

Abstract

In the present paper, we propose a variant of game semantics to characterize the syntactic notion of reduction *syntax-independently*. For this purpose, we introduce the notion of *"external"* and *"internal"* moves and the so-called *hiding operation* in game semantics, resulting in a *"dynamic"* variant of games and strategies.

Categorically, the dynamic games and strategies give rise to a cartesian closed bicategory [Oua97] which is a generalization of the category of HO-games and strategies [HO00, McC98], where all the standard entities and constructions in game semantics are accommodated. In formulating it, we obtained a generalization of the existing notions and established some algebraic laws which are new to the literature.

As a future work, we shall establish the exact correspondence between the hiding operation and reduction, which is the main aim of the dynamic variant of game semantics. Also, we are planning to develop it as a mathematical model of computation. Moreover, we shall consider connections with homotopy type theory [V$^+$13].

Contents

1 Introduction **3**

2 Dynamic Games **5**
2.1 Dynamic Games 5
2.1.1 Dynamic Arenas 6

2.1.2 Justified Sequences . . . 7
2.1.3 Hiding Operation on Arenas and Justified Sequences . . . 8
2.1.4 Legal Positions and Threads . . . 12
2.1.5 Dynamic Games . . . 16
2.2 Hiding Operation on Games . . . 20
2.3 Explicit Games and External Equality . . . 26
2.4 Constructions on Games . . . 26
2.4.1 Tensor Product . . . 26
2.4.2 Linear Implication . . . 29
2.4.3 Product . . . 31
2.4.4 Exponential . . . 32
2.4.5 Explicit Linear Implication . . . 34
2.4.6 External interaction . . . 35
2.4.7 Notation . . . 41
2.5 Subgames . . . 41
2.6 Homomorphism Theorem for Hiding on Games . . . 46
2.6.1 Hiding Operation on External Interaction . . . 46
2.6.2 Homomorphism Theorem for Hiding on Games . . . 49

3 Dynamic Strategies **54**
3.1 Dynamic Strategies . . . 54
3.2 Hiding Operation on Strategies . . . 57
3.3 Normal Form and External Equality . . . 62
3.4 Constructions on Strategies . . . 62
3.4.1 Copy-cat Strategies . . . 63
3.4.2 Non-hiding Composition . . . 63
3.4.3 Standard Composition . . . 64
3.4.4 External Composition . . . 64
3.4.5 Tensor Product . . . 66
3.4.6 Paring . . . 66
3.4.7 Promotion . . . 67
3.4.8 Dereliction . . . 68
3.4.9 Parallel Product . . . 70
3.4.10 Notation . . . 73
3.5 Homomorphism Theorem for Hiding on Strategies . . . 73

4 Categorical Structures **76**
4.1 Bicategory of Dynamic Games and Strategies . . . 76
4.2 Cartesian Closed Structure . . . 80
4.2.1 The Basic Idea of Cartesian Closed Bicategories . . . 81
4.2.2 The Bicategory $\mathcal{CCD}$ . . . 81
4.2.3 Biterminal Objects . . . 84
4.2.4 Binary Biproducts . . . 85
4.2.5 Biexponentials . . . 89
4.3 Hiding Functor . . . 92

5 Game-semantic Computational Process **94**
5.1 Algorithm SEQ 94
5.2 Algorithm HID 95

6 Future Works **96**

A Proofs of Technical Lemmata **98**
A.1 Independent View in Tensor Products 98
A.2 View Lemma EI 99

1 Introduction

In the literature of game semantics, various notions of games and strategies have been proposed to model different programming features [AJM00, HO00, Nic94, McC98, AM97, AM98, HY97, Lai97, AJ05, Hug00, AHM98, AGM$^+$04, AM99]. However, such game-semantic models have been always *"static"* in the sense that the terms in a chain of (syntactic) reductions are interpreted as the same: If we have $t_1 \to^* t_2$ in syntax, then we only have an equation $[\![t_1]\!] = [\![t_2]\!]$ in game semantics. This is essentially because, for a composition of strategies in the existing game semantics, the "internal communication" is *a priori* hidden, and the resulting strategy is *always in "normal form"*. Hence, the existing game semantics does not capture the *dynamism* of computation.

Then, in order to model the dynamic computational process of reduction, we propose a variant of games and strategies in the present paper, in which a distinction between *external* and *internal* moves is made; internal moves are to be *a posteriori* hidden by an operation, so that the process of *"hiding internal communication"* is explicitly formulated. They are a generalization of the so-called HO-games [HO00] (in the style of [McC98]), and accommodates all the standard entities and constructions of game semantics in the literature. We call the resulting structure *dynamic* games and strategies. Importantly, the dynamic strategies are not always in normal form, and the game-semantic interpretation of normalization is established as the hiding operation.

The dynamic games and strategies give rise to a new mathematical structure, in which many beautiful algebraic laws are established. Categorically, they form a *cartesian closed bicategory* (in the formulation of [Oua97]) $\mathcal{CCD}$. We then aim to develop a game semantics in $\mathcal{CCD}$, which should be called the *dynamic game semantics*. In the dynamic game semantics, reduction is interpreted as *"hiding internal moves"* in a strategy. This seems a natural phenomenon, because the Curry-Howard correspondence states that reduction in the typed λ-calculus corresponds to "eliminating detours" (i.e., proof normalization) in natural deduction. That is, it seems another instance of *computation as "eliminating redundant processes"*.

With this mathematical structure, we aim to obtain a fully semantic (i.e., syntax-independent) characterization of the syntactic notion of reduction, by establishing the *"dynamic"* correspondence between the hiding operation and

reduction (it will be explained in the final section of the paper). Furthermore, note that we have formulated an elementary operation of hiding, which was not captured previously; thus, by further going in this direction, i.e., making elementary operations explicit, we shall develop it as a new mathematical model of computation, where *intensionality* in computation is formulated. Then, for instance, it would be a useful computational complexity measure. Moreover, we shall consider connections with homotopy type theory [V$^+$13].

Overview of the present paper. The rest of the paper proceeds as follows. In Section 2, we develop the notion of *dynamic games*, in which we define the so-called *hiding operation* on them and accommodate all the standard games and constructions in the literature, plus some of the new constructions. In Section 3, we define strategies on dynamic games, called *dynamic strategies*, and the *hiding operation* on them. Again, all the standard strategies and constructions are accommodated, in which some of the generalizations are made. Then in Section 4, the climax of the paper, the categorical structures of the dynamic games and strategies are studied; they in fact form a cartesian closed bicateogy [Oua97]. Finally, note that our variant of games and strategies are based on the existing ones, specifically the HO-games [HO00] in the style of [McC98], so we mainly focus on explaining new structures and results; for the existing notions, see, e.g., the book [McC98].

2 Dynamic Games

The main aim of this paper is to formulate the syntactic notion of reduction *syntax-independently* in game semantics, namely as the process of *"hiding internal moves"* in a strategy.

In order to formulate this idea, we need to consider strategies in which a distinction between *internal* and *external* moves is made; internal moves are to be *a posteriori* hidden by some operation. We call this type of strategies *dynamic strategies*.

But to define dynamic strategies systematically, we first need to reformulate the existing universe of games (here we select the so-called HO-games [HO00] in the style of [McC98]) in such a way that can accommodate the new structure which dynamic strategies bring; we shall call such reformulated games *dynamic games*. Note that this is just the beginning of the story: As we shall see, this simple idea will introduce interesting mathematical structures and establish beautiful algebraic laws, generalizing the category of HO-games.

We begin with defining the universe of dynamic games.

2.1 Dynamic Games

Essentially, *dynamic games* are the so-called HO-games [HO00, McC98] in which each move is either *"internal"* or *"external"* and the plays satisfy certain additional axioms. Conceptually internal moves are visible only for Player and invisible for Opponent, and so they are rather "unofficial" moves for the game and can be seen as detailed descriptions (or algorithms) of how Player computes the next "official" (i.e., external) move. On the other hand, external moves are visible for everyone and consist of the "official part" of the game.

Naturally, since internal moves are invisible for Opponent and he cannot respond to them, Player must "play alone" for the internal part of a play. This is achieved by requiring that internal Opponent's moves are always *deterministic*. This is the idea behind the definition of dynamic games.

We first fix some notation:

Notation 2.1.1. In game semantics, a play of a game is a certain sequence of "moves". Thus, we fix some notational convention for sequences.

- We use letters s, t, u, v, w, etc. to denote sequences.
- We use letters $a, b, c, d, e, m, n, p, q$, etc. to denote elements of sequences.
- A concatenation of sequences are represented by a juxtaposition of them.
- We usually write as, tb, ucv for $(a)s$, $t(b)$, $u(c)v$, respectively.
- For readability, we sometimes write $s.t$ for the concatenation st.
- We write even$\{s\}$ and odd$\{t\}$ to mean that the sequences s and t are of even-length and odd-length, respectively.

- We write $s \preceq t$ (resp. $s \prec t$) if s is a (resp. strict) prefix of t.
- We write $s \sqsubseteq t$ (resp. $s \sqsubset t$) if s is a (resp. strict) subsequence of t.
- Given a sequence s and a set X, we write $s \restriction X$ for the subsequence of s which consists of elements in X. In practice, we often have $s \in Z^*$ with $Z = X + Y$ for some set Y; in such a case, we abuse the notation: The operation deletes the "tags" for the disjoint union and $s \restriction X \in X^*$.
- For a function $f : A \to B$ and a subset $S \subseteq A$, we define $f \restriction S : S \to B$ to be the restriction of f to S.

2.1.1 Dynamic Arenas

Like the usual HO-games, our notion of games is based on a preliminary concept, called *arenas*. Conceptually, an arena defines basic elements of a game: possible *moves* and their *labels*, as well as *which moves are possible responses* to each move. And then, in terms of its *legal positions*, the arena formulates minimum rules of the game (a play of the game will be defined as a certain type of a legal position).

We call our variant of arenas *dynamic arenas*:

Definition 2.1.2 (Dynamic arenas)**.** A **dynamic arena** is a triple

$$G = (M_G, \lambda_G, \vdash_G)$$

where

- M_G is a set, whose elements are called **moves**.
- λ_G is a function from M_G to $\{\mathrm{O}, \mathrm{P}\} \times \{\mathrm{Q}, \mathrm{A}\} \times \mathbb{N}$, where O, P, Q, A are some distinguished symbols, and $\mathbb{N}$ is the set of natural numbers, called the **labeling function**.
- $\vdash_G$ is a subset of the set $(\{\star\} + M_G) \times M_G$, where $\star$ is an arbitrary element, called the **enabling relation**, which satisfies the following conditions:

  (E1) If $\star \vdash_G m$, then $\lambda_G(m) = \mathrm{OQ0}$ and $n \vdash_G m \Leftrightarrow n = \star$

  (E2) If $m \vdash_G n$ and $\lambda_G^{\mathrm{QA}}(n) = \mathrm{A}$, then $\lambda_G^{\mathrm{QA}}(m) = \mathrm{Q}$ and $\lambda_G^{\mathbb{N}}(m) = \lambda_G^{\mathbb{N}}(n)$

  (E3) If $m \vdash_G n$ and $m \neq \star$, then $\lambda_G^{\mathrm{OP}}(m) \neq \lambda_G^{\mathrm{OP}}(n)$

  (E4) If $m \vdash_G n$, $m \neq \star$ and $\lambda_G^{\mathbb{N}}(m) \neq \lambda_G^{\mathbb{N}}(n)$, then $\lambda_G^{\mathrm{OP}}(m) = \mathrm{O}$ and $\lambda_G^{\mathrm{OP}}(n) = \mathrm{P}$.

  For the notation $\lambda_G^{\mathrm{QA}}, \lambda_G^{\mathrm{OP}}, \lambda_G^{\mathbb{N}}$, see Notation 2.1.3 below.

We often call a dynamic arena just an **arena**.

The idea behind the notion of enabling relations is as follows: In a game, every non-initial move m is made for a previous move n, and an enabling relation designates, by $n \vdash_G m$, that m can be in fact made for n.

Note that the notion of a dynamic arena is just an arena defined in [McC98] equipped with the EI (external/internal) label by natural numbers and some additional axioms.

Notation 2.1.3. Given an arena G, we use the following notation:

- $\lambda_G^{\mathrm{OP}} \stackrel{\mathrm{df.}}{=} \lambda_G; \pi_1 : M_G \to \{\mathrm{O}, \mathrm{P}\}$
- $\lambda_G^{\mathrm{QA}} \stackrel{\mathrm{df.}}{=} \lambda_G; \pi_2 : M_G \to \{\mathrm{Q}, \mathrm{A}\}$
- $\lambda_G^{\mathbb{N}} \stackrel{\mathrm{df.}}{=} \lambda_G; \pi_3 : M_G \to \mathbb{N}$
- $\lambda_G^{+n} \stackrel{\mathrm{df.}}{=} \langle \lambda_G^{\mathrm{OP}}, \lambda_G^{\mathrm{QA}}, \lambda_G^{\mathbb{N}}; \lambda x.(x + n) \rangle$
- $\lambda_G^{\ominus n} \stackrel{\mathrm{df.}}{=} \langle \lambda_G^{\mathrm{OP}}, \lambda_G^{\mathrm{QA}}, \lambda_G^{\mathbb{N}}; \lambda x.(x \ominus n) \rangle$, where $x \ominus n \stackrel{\mathrm{df.}}{=} \begin{cases} x - n & \text{if } x \geqslant n \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$
- $\overline{\lambda_G} \stackrel{\mathrm{df.}}{=} \langle \overline{\lambda_G^{\mathrm{OP}}}, \lambda_G^{\mathrm{QA}}, \lambda_G^{\mathbb{N}} \rangle$, where $\overline{\lambda_G^{\mathrm{OP}}}(m) \stackrel{\mathrm{df.}}{=} \begin{cases} \mathrm{P} & \text{if } \lambda_G^{\mathrm{OP}}(m) = \mathrm{O} \\ \mathrm{O} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$
- $M_G^d \stackrel{\mathrm{df.}}{=} \{ m \in M_G \mid \lambda_G^{\mathbb{N}}(m) = d \}$ for each $d \in \mathbb{N}$
- $M_G^{\diamondsuit d} \stackrel{\mathrm{df.}}{=} \{ m \in M_G \mid \lambda_G^{\mathbb{N}}(m) \diamondsuit d \}$ for each $d \in \mathbb{N}$, where $\diamondsuit$ is either $<, \leqslant, >$ or $\geqslant$

A move $m \in M_G$ is called

- **initial** if $\star \vdash_G m$
- an **O-move** if $\lambda_G^{\mathrm{OP}}(m) = \mathrm{O}$ and a **P-move** if $\lambda_G^{\mathrm{OP}}(m) = \mathrm{P}$
- a **question** if $\lambda_G^{\mathrm{QA}}(m) = \mathrm{Q}$ and an **answer** if $\lambda_G^{\mathrm{QA}}(m) = \mathrm{A}$ (moreover, a question m is said to be **answered** by an answer n if $m \vdash_G n$)
- **external** if $\lambda_G^{\mathbb{N}}(m) = 0$ and **internal** if $\lambda_G^{\mathbb{N}}(m) > 0$
- **k-internal** if $\lambda_G^{\mathbb{N}}(m) = k > 0$; in particular, it is called **immediately internal** if it is 1-internal

2.1.2 Justified Sequences

Given an arena, we are interested in a certain kind of sequences of the moves, called the *justified sequences*.

Definition 2.1.4 (Justified sequences and justifiers [HO00, McC98])**.** A **justified sequence** in an arena G is a finite sequence $s \in M_G^*$, in which each non-initial move m is associated with (or points at) a move $\mathcal{J}_s(m)$, called the **justifier** of m in s, that occurs previously in s and satisfies $\mathcal{J}_s(m) \vdash_G m$. We also say that m is **justified** by $\mathcal{J}_s(m)$.

We often drop the subscript s in $\mathcal{J}_s$ when s is clear. Note that the function $\mathcal{J}_s$ is an essential structure of a justified sequence s, i.e., a justified sequence is a sequence of moves equipped with justification relations. We sometimes call the relation of the pair $(\mathcal{J}_s(m), m)$ the **pointer** of (from) m to $\mathcal{J}_s(m)$.

2.1.3 Hiding Operation on Arenas and Justified Sequences

We now define similar concepts from the "external point of view".

Definition 2.1.5 (External justifiers)**.** Let s be a justified sequence in an arena G. Then each non-initial move m occurring in s has a sequence of justifiers

$$\mathcal{J}_s(m) = m_1, \mathcal{J}_s(m_1) = m_2, \ldots, \mathcal{J}_s(m_{k-1}) = m_k, \mathcal{J}_s(m_k) = n$$

where $m_1, \ldots, m_k$ are immediately internal but n is not (note that k may be 0). Then n is said to be the **1-external justifier** of m, and written $\mathcal{J}_s^{\ominus 1}(m)$. More in general, for any $d \in \mathbb{N}^+$, if $m_1, \ldots, m_k$ are j-internal with $j \leqslant d$ but n is not, then n is said to be the **d-external justifier** of m and written $\mathcal{J}_s^{\ominus d}(m)$. Moreover, n is called the **external justifier** of m and written $\mathcal{J}_s^{\ominus \omega}(m)$ if it is the d-external justifier of m for all $d \in \mathbb{N}^+$ (i.e., if n is external).

Again, we often drop the subscript s.

Definition 2.1.6 (External subsequences)**.** Let s be a justified sequence in an arena G. For each $d \in \mathbb{N}^+$, the **d-external subsequence** of s, denoted by $\mathcal{H}_G^d(s)$, is the subsequence of s obtained by deleting the moves in s that are j-internal with $j \leqslant d$, equipped with the pointer $\mathcal{J}_s^{\ominus d}$, i.e., $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{H}_G^d(s)} \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \mathcal{J}_s^{\ominus d}$ (strictly speaking, $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{H}_G^d(s)}$ is a restriction of $\mathcal{J}_s^{\ominus d}$). Moreover, the **external subsequence** of s, written $\mathcal{H}_G^\omega(s)$, is the subsequence of s obtained by deleting all the internal moves in s, equipped with the pointer $\mathcal{J}_s^{\ominus \omega}$.

Again, we often drop the subscript G.

Definition 2.1.7 (Hiding operation on justified sequences)**.** Let G be an arena. We usually write $\mathcal{H}_G(s)$ for $\mathcal{H}_G^1(s)$, where s is a justified sequence in G, and regard $\mathcal{H}_G$ as an operation, called the **hiding operation** on the justified sequences in G.

We now define the *hiding operation* on arenas:

Definition 2.1.8 (Hiding operation on arenas)**.** The **hiding operation** $\mathcal{H}$ on arenas is defined as follows: For an arena G, the arena $\mathcal{H}(G)$ is given by

- $M_{\mathcal{H}(G)} \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \{m \in M_G \mid \lambda^{\mathbb{N}}_G(m) \neq 1\}$
- $\lambda_{\mathcal{H}(G)} \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \lambda^{\ominus 1}_G \restriction M_{\mathcal{H}(G)}$
- $m \vdash_{\mathcal{H}(G)} n$

  $\stackrel{\text{df.}}{\Leftrightarrow} \exists k \in \mathbb{N}. \exists x_1, \ldots, x_{2k} \in M^1_G. m \vdash_G x_1, x_1 \vdash_G x_2, \ldots, x_{2k-1} \vdash_G x_{2k}, x_{2k} \vdash_G n$

  which includes the case where $k = 0$ and $m \vdash_G n$

Of course, we need to establish:

Lemma 2.1.9 (Closure of arenas under hiding)**.** For any dynamic arena G, the structure $\mathcal{H}(G)$ forms a well-defined dynamic arena.

Proof. Clearly, the set of moves and the labeling function are well-defined. It remains to verify the axioms for the enabling relation.

- **(E1)** Note that if $\star \vdash_G m$, then $\lambda^{\mathbb{N}}_G(m) = 0$, and so $m \in M_{\mathcal{H}(G)}$. Therefore

  $$\star \vdash_{\mathcal{H}(G)} m \Leftrightarrow \star \vdash_G m$$

  Thus, if $\star \vdash_{\mathcal{H}(G)} m$, then $\lambda_{\mathcal{H}(G)}(m) = \mathrm{OQ0}$ and $n \vdash_{\mathcal{H}(G)} m \Leftrightarrow n = \star$.

- **(E2)** Assume that $m \vdash_{\mathcal{H}(G)} n$ and $\lambda^{\mathrm{QA}}_{\mathcal{H}(G)}(n) = \mathrm{A}$. Note that $m \neq \star$ and $\lambda^{\mathrm{QA}}_G(n) = \lambda^{\mathrm{QA}}_{\mathcal{H}(G)}(n) = \mathrm{A}$. If $m \vdash_G n$, then

  $$\lambda^{\mathrm{QA}}_{\mathcal{H}(G)}(m) = \lambda^{\mathrm{QA}}_G(m) = \mathrm{Q}$$
  $$\lambda^{\mathbb{N}}_{\mathcal{H}(G)}(m) = \lambda^{\mathbb{N}}_G(m) \ominus 1 = \lambda^{\mathbb{N}}_G(n) \ominus 1 = \lambda^{\mathbb{N}}_{\mathcal{H}(G)}(n)$$

  If, for some $k \in \mathbb{N}^+$ and $x_1, \ldots, x_{2k} \in M^1_G$, we have

  $$m \vdash_G x_1, x_1 \vdash_G x_2, \ldots, x_{2k-1} \vdash_G x_{2k}, x_{2k} \vdash_G n$$

  then in particular $x_{2k} \vdash_G n$ but $\lambda^{\mathbb{N}}_G(x_{2k}) = 1 \neq 0 = \lambda^{\mathbb{N}}_G(n)$, a contradiction. That is, this case cannot happen.

- **(E3)** Assume that $m \vdash_{\mathcal{H}(G)} n$ and $m \neq \star$. If $m \vdash_G n$, then we have

  $$\lambda^{\mathrm{OP}}_{\mathcal{H}(G)}(m) = \lambda^{\mathrm{OP}}_G(m) \neq \lambda^{\mathrm{OP}}_G(n) = \lambda^{\mathrm{OP}}_{\mathcal{H}(G)}(n)$$

  If we have

  $$m \vdash_G x_1, x_1 \vdash_G x_2, \ldots, x_{2k-1} \vdash_G x_{2k}, x_{2k} \vdash_G n$$

  for some $k \in \mathbb{N}^+$ and $x_1, \ldots, x_{2k} \in M^1_G$, then

  $$\begin{aligned}\lambda^{\mathrm{OP}}_{\mathcal{H}(G)}(m) &= \lambda^{\mathrm{OP}}_G(m) \\ &= \lambda^{\mathrm{OP}}_G(x_2) = \lambda^{\mathrm{OP}}_G(x_4) = \cdots = \lambda^{\mathrm{OP}}_G(x_{2k}) \neq \lambda^{\mathrm{OP}}_G(n) = \lambda^{\mathrm{OP}}_{\mathcal{H}(G)}(n)\end{aligned}$$

  Thus in either case, the axiom holds.

- **(E4)** Assume $m \vdash_{\mathcal{H}(G)} n$, $m \neq \star$, and $\lambda^{\mathbb{N}}_{\mathcal{H}(G)}(m) \neq \lambda^{\mathbb{N}}_{\mathcal{H}(G)}(n)$. Then we have $\lambda^{\mathbb{N}}_{G}(m) \neq \lambda^{\mathbb{N}}_{G}(n)$. Thus, if $m \vdash_G n$, then it is trivial; so assume the other case for $m \vdash_{\mathcal{H}(G)} n$. Then by the same argument as that for (E3), it is easy to see that $\lambda^{\mathrm{OP}}_{\mathcal{H}(G)}(m) = \mathrm{O}$ and $\lambda^{\mathrm{OP}}_{\mathcal{H}(G)}(n) = \mathrm{P}$.

Thus, the structure $\mathcal{H}(G)$ forms a dynamic arena. □

Notation 2.1.10. We write $\mathcal{H}^i$ for i-times application of the hiding operation $\mathcal{H}$ on arenas for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$; in particular, $\mathcal{H}^0$ denotes "nothing is applied". Also, we denote $\mathcal{H}^\omega$ for the countably-infinite times application of $\mathcal{H}$. This notation applies also for the hiding operations on games, strategies, etc., which will be introduced later.

Next, we establish another important fact:

Lemma 2.1.11 (Preservation of justified sequences under hiding)**.** For each justified sequence s in an arena G, the 1-external subsequence $\mathcal{H}_G(s)$ is a justified sequence in the arena $\mathcal{H}(G)$.

Proof. Assume that m is a non-initial move that occurs in $\mathcal{H}_G(s)$; we have to show that the justifier $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{H}_G(s)}(m)$ occurs earlier than m in $\mathcal{H}_G(s)$ and satisfies $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{H}_G(s)}(m) \vdash m$. Since s is a justified sequence in G and m is non-initial in G as well, we may write

$$s = s_1.n.s_2.m.s_3$$

where $\mathcal{J}_s(m) = n$.

- If $n \notin M^1_G$, then we have $n \vdash_{\mathcal{H}(G)} m$ by $n \vdash_G m$, and by the definition, the pointer of m in $\mathcal{H}_G(s)$ still points to n. Thus, $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{H}_G(s)}(m) = n$ and the requirement is satisfied in this case.
- If $n \in M^1_G$, then n must be non-initial; so consider the justifier n_1 of n in G. If $n_1 \in M^1_G$, then we can apply the same argument. Iterating this process, we obtain a sequence of enabling pairs with respect to $\vdash_G$

  $$n' \vdash_G n_{2k-1}, n_{2k-1} \vdash_G n_{2k-2}, \ldots, n_2 \vdash_G n_1, n_1 \vdash_G n, n \vdash_G m$$

  where $k \in \mathbb{N}, n_1, \ldots, n_{2k-1} \in M^1_G, n' \notin M^1_G$ by the axioms (E3) and (E4) for G. Thus, by the definition, $n' \vdash_{\mathcal{H}(G)} m$, and the pointer of m in $\mathcal{H}_G(s)$ must point to n'. So $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{H}_G(s)}(m) = n'$ and the justification condition is satisfied in this case too.

□

As the notation suggests, we have the following:

Proposition 2.1.12 (Inductive hiding on justified sequences)**.** Let G be an arena, and s a justified sequence in G. Then for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$, we have the following equation between justified sequences in the arena $\mathcal{H}^{i+1}(G)$:

$$\mathcal{H}^{i+1}_G(s) = \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{H}^i(G)}(\mathcal{H}^i_G(s))$$

Thus, we have the following equation between operations that map a justified sequence in the arena G to a justified sequence in $\mathcal{H}^i(G)$ for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$\mathcal{H}^i_G = \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{H}^{i-1}(G)} \circ \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{H}^{i-2}(G)} \circ \cdots \circ \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{H}(G)} \circ \mathcal{H}_G$$

Proof. By induction on i. The base case is trivial: When $i = 0$, the equation becomes

$$\mathcal{H}^1_G(s) = \mathcal{H}_G(s)$$

and both sequences are justified sequences in the arena $\mathcal{H}(G)$ by Lemma 2.1.11.

Next, assume that the claim for i holds; we have to establish the claim for $i + 1$. By the assumption, $\mathcal{H}^i_G(s)$ is a justified sequence in the arena $\mathcal{H}^i(G)$. Hence, by Lemma 2.1.11, $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{H}^i(G)}(\mathcal{H}^i_G(s))$ is a justified sequence in the arena $\mathcal{H}^{i+1}(G)$.

It remains to show the equation $\mathcal{H}^{i+1}_G(s) = \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{H}^i(G)}(\mathcal{H}^i_G(s))$. Note that $\mathcal{H}^{i+1}_G(s)$ is the subsequence of s, which is obtained by deleting all the moves m such that $1 \leqslant \lambda^{\mathbb{N}}_G(m) \leqslant i + 1$, equipped with the pointer $\mathcal{J}_s^{\ominus(i+1)}$. On the other hand, $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{H}^i(G)}(\mathcal{H}^i_G(s))$ is a subsequence of $\mathcal{H}^i_G(s)$, which is obtained by deleting all the moves m such that $\lambda^{\mathbb{N}}_{\mathcal{H}^i(G)}(m) = 1$, equipped with the pointer $\mathcal{J}^{\ominus 1}_{\mathcal{H}^i(G)} = (\mathcal{J}_s^{\ominus i})^{\ominus 1} = \mathcal{J}_s^{\ominus(i+1)}$. Note that $\lambda^{\mathbb{N}}_{\mathcal{H}^i(G)}(m) = 1 \Leftrightarrow \lambda^{\mathbb{N}}_G(m) = i + 1$, and $\mathcal{H}^i_G(s)$ is obtained from s by deleting all the moves m with $1 \leqslant \lambda^{\mathbb{N}}_G(m) \leqslant i$. So they are in fact the same justified sequences in the arena $\mathcal{H}^{i+1}(G)$. □

Due to this result, we employ:

Convention 2.1.13. We now regard the d-external subsequence $\mathcal{H}^d_G(s)$ of a justified sequence s in an arena G as the result of applying the operation $\mathcal{H}^d_G$ to s. Moreover, as Proposition 2.1.12 establishes, applying the operation $\mathcal{H}^d_G$ is equivalent to applying the operation $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}^1$ d-times, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{H}^d_G = \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(G)} \circ \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{H}^{d-2}(G)} \circ \cdots \circ \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{H}(G)} \circ \mathcal{H}_G$$

Then, as a convention, we take just $\mathcal{H}^1$ as an "official" operation, and $\mathcal{H}^d_G$ with $d > 1$ always denotes the abbreviation of $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{H}^{d-1}(G)} \circ \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{H}^{d-2}(G)} \circ \cdots \circ \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{H}(G)} \circ \mathcal{H}_G$.

We also have an immediate consequence:

Corollary 2.1.14 (Generalization of Lemma 2.1.11)**.** For each justified sequence s in an arena G, the d-external subsequence $\mathcal{H}^d_G(s)$ is a justified sequence in the arena $\mathcal{H}^d(G)$ for each $d \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. Immediate from Proposition 2.1.12. □

To deal with external subsequences in a rigorous way, we need to extend the hiding operation to the one on subsequences of a justified sequence:

Definition 2.1.15 (Point-wise hiding operation)**.** Let s be a justified sequence in an arena G. We define the **point-wise hiding** operation $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}^s_G$ on each move m and the pointers to m in s by

$$\widehat{\mathcal{H}}^s_G(m) \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \begin{cases} \epsilon, \text{ the pointers to } m \text{ changed to pointing } \mathcal{J}_s(m) & \text{if } m \text{ is 1-internal} \\ m, \text{ the pointers to } m \text{ unchanged} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Furthermore, for any subsequence $v = m_1 \dots m_k$ of s, $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}^s_G(v)$ is defined to be the result of applying $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}^s_G$ to each m_i for $i = 1, \dots, k$.

Note that the point-wise hiding operation $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}^s_G$ makes sense only in the context of s; it affects some part of s. The point here is that the (usual) hiding operation on justified sequences can be executed in the "point-wise" fashion: The effect of the (usual) hiding operation coincides with the result of applying the point-wise hiding operation, as the following proposition establishes.

Proposition 2.1.16 (Homomorphism theorem for hiding on justified sequences)**.** For any justified sequence s of an arena G, we have

$$\mathcal{H}_G(s) = \widehat{\mathcal{H}}^s_G(s)$$

Proof. It suffices to establish, for each justified sequence $s = m_1 \dots m_k$ in G, the equation

$$\mathcal{H}_G(s) = \widehat{\mathcal{H}}^s_G(m_1) \dots \widehat{\mathcal{H}}^s_G(m_k)$$

First, it is clear by the definition that $\mathcal{H}_G(s)$ and $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}^s_G(m_1) \dots \widehat{\mathcal{H}}^s_G(m_k)$ are both the subsequence of s obtained by deleting all the 1-internal moves. Thus, it suffices to show that each move m in $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}^s_G(m_1) \dots \widehat{\mathcal{H}}^s_G(m_k)$ points to $\mathcal{J}_s^{\ominus 1}(m)$.

Let m be any move in s which is not 1-internal. For the pointer from m in $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}^s_G(m_1) \dots \widehat{\mathcal{H}}^s_G(m_k)$, it suffices to consider the subsequence $nx_1 \dots x_l m$ of s, where $x_1, \dots, x_l$ are 1-internal but n is not, satisfying

$$\mathcal{J}_s(m) = x_l, \mathcal{J}_s(x_l) = x_{l-1}, \dots, \mathcal{J}_s(x_2) = x_1, \mathcal{J}_s(x_1) = n$$

because the operation on the other moves will not affect the pointers from m.

Applying the operation $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}^s_G$ to $x_1, \dots, x_l$ in any order, it is straightforward to see that the resulting pointer from m points to n, which is $\mathcal{J}_s^{\ominus 1}(m)$. □

By virtue of the proposition, we may identify the operations $\mathcal{H}_G$ and $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}^s_G$; and from now on, we shall not notationally distinguish them, and use only the former. As a result, what we have established is the "point-wise" procedure to execute the hiding operation on justified sequences, in which the order of the moves to apply the point-wise operation is irrelevant.

2.1.4 Legal Positions and Threads

Next, we introduce important preliminary notions for defining games.

Definition 2.1.17 (Views [HO00, McC98])**.** Given a justified sequence s in an arena G, we define the **Player view** (or the **P-view** for short) $\lceil s \rceil_G$ and the **Opponent view** (or the **O-view** for short) $\lfloor s \rfloor_G$ by induction on the length of s as follows:

- $\lceil \epsilon \rceil_G \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \epsilon$
- $\lceil sm \rceil_G \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \lceil s \rceil_G.m$, if m is a P-move
- $\lceil sm \rceil_G \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} m$, if m is initial
- $\lceil smtn \rceil_G \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \lceil s \rceil_G.mn$, if n is an O-move with $\mathcal{J}_{\lceil s \rceil.mn}(n) = m$
- $\lfloor \epsilon \rfloor_G \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \epsilon$
- $\lfloor sm \rfloor_G \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \lfloor s \rfloor_G.m$, if m is an O-move
- $\lfloor smtn \rfloor_G \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \lfloor s \rfloor_G.mn$, if n is a P-move with $\mathcal{J}_{\lfloor s \rfloor.mn}(n) = m$

We often drop the subscript G in $\lceil \_ \rceil_G$, $\lfloor \_ \rfloor_G$ when it is clear form the context. Note that the last move of a justified sequence s coincides with the last move of both $\lceil s \rceil_G$ and $\lfloor s \rfloor_G$. Also, note that there is exactly one initial move in the P-view of any justified sequence, while there may be more than one in the O-view.

Conceptually, the view is a "currently relevant" subsequence of previous moves:

- A P-view $\lceil s \rceil$ consists of some previous P-moves, followed by the enabled O-moves; in other words, its a partial history of "how Opponent responds to P-moves".
- Then, as required later (by the *visibility* condition), for each play sm with m a P-move, m's justifier $\mathcal{J}(m)$ must occur in $\lceil s \rceil$. Hence, by an inductive argument (see Lemma 2.1.24 below), Player can observe, in the P-view, all the relevant previous moves.
- It is similar for the notion of O-views.

Below, we present a fundamental preliminary definition for the notion of dynamic games:

Definition 2.1.18 (Dynamic legal positions)**.** A **dynamic legal position** in an arena G is a sequence $s \in M_G^*$ that satisfies the following conditions:

- **Justification.** s is a justified sequence in G.
- **Alternation.** If $s = s_1 mn s_2$, then $\lambda_G^{\mathrm{OP}}(m) \neq \lambda_G^{\mathrm{OP}}(n)$.
- **Bracketing.** If $tqua \preceq s$, where the question q is answered by a, then there is no unanswered question in u.

- **Visibility.** For any prefix $tm \preceq s$ with m non-initial,
  - if m is a P-move, then the justifier $\mathcal{J}_s(m)$ occurs in $\lceil t \rceil_G$;
  - if m is an O-move, then the justifier $\mathcal{J}_s(m)$ occurs in $\lfloor t \rfloor_G$.
- **External visibility.** For any prefix $tm \preceq s$ with m non-initial and external,
  - if m is a P-move, then the external justifier $\mathcal{J}_s^{\ominus\omega}(m)$ occurs in $\lceil \mathcal{H}_G^\omega(t) \rceil_{\mathcal{H}^\omega(G)}$;
  - if m is an O-move, then the external justifier $\mathcal{J}_s^{\ominus\omega}(m)$ occurs in $\lfloor \mathcal{H}_G^\omega(t) \rfloor_{\mathcal{H}^\omega(G)}$.
- **EI-switch.** If s is in the form of

  $$s = s_1 mn s_2$$

  such that $\lambda_G^{\mathbb{N}}(m) \neq \lambda_G^{\mathbb{N}}(n)$, then m is an O-move and n is a P-move.

The set of all the dynamic legal positions of an arena G is denoted by L_G. We usually call a dynamic legal position just a **legal position**.

Note that our definition of legal positions is just the one defined in [McC98], additionally with the external visibility and EI-switch conditions. In terms of legal positions, an arena specifies the basic requirement of a game.

We may require more constraints; the motivation will be clarified shortly.

Definition 2.1.19 (Fully dynamic legal positions)**.** A legal position s in an arena G is said to be **fully dynamic** if it satisfies the following condition:

- **Generalized visibility.** For each natural number $d \in \mathbb{N}$, if s is in the form of $s = tmu$ with m non-initial and $\lambda_G^{\mathbb{N}}(m) = 0 \vee \lambda_G^{\mathbb{N}}(m) > d$, then:
  - if m is a P-move, then the justifier $\mathcal{J}_s^{\ominus d}(m)$ occurs in $\lceil \mathcal{H}_G^d(t) \rceil_{\mathcal{H}^d(G)}$;
  - if m is an O-move, then the justifier $\mathcal{J}_s^{\ominus d}(m)$ occurs in $\lfloor \mathcal{H}_G^d(t) \rfloor_{\mathcal{H}^d(G)}$.

  The condition for each $d \in \mathbb{N}$ is called the **visibility of degree** d or d**-visibility** for short.

We write L_G^{fd} for the set of all the fully dynamic legal positions in G.

Note that the generalized visibility implies both the visibility and external visibility, which is the motivation behind the term "generalized".

Example 2.1.20 (Example of arenas)**.** The simplest arena is the *empty arena* $I = (\emptyset, \emptyset, \emptyset)$.

Another simple example is the *natural numbers arena*

$$N = (M_N, \lambda_N, \vdash_N)$$

where

- $M_N \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \{q\} + \mathbb{N}$, where q is an arbitrary element and $\mathbb{N}$ is the set of natural numbers
- $\lambda_N : q \mapsto \mathrm{OQ0}, (n \in \mathbb{N}) \mapsto \mathrm{PA0}$
- $\vdash_N \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \{(\star, q)\} \cup \{(q, n) \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$

A legal position of I is only the trivial position ϵ; the legal positions of N are $\epsilon, q, qn, qnq, qn_1qn_2$, etc. Note that these games do not have any internal moves.

We have an immediate lemma:

Lemma 2.1.21 (Internal communication)**.** Let s be a legal position in an arena G. If s contains a subsequence $mx_1x_2 \ldots x_kn$, where m and n are non-1-internal, $x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_k$ are 1-internal, and

$$\mathcal{J}(n) = x_k, \mathcal{J}(x_k) = x_{k-1}, \ldots, \mathcal{J}(x_2) = x_1, \mathcal{J}(x_1) = m$$

then k is even, and m, n are O-, P- moves respectively.

Proof. Actually, the assumption can be weakened: It suffices to assume that $\lambda^{\mathbb{N}}_G(m) \neq \lambda^{\mathbb{N}}_G(x_1)$ and $\lambda^{\mathbb{N}}_G(x_k) \neq \lambda^{\mathbb{N}}_G(n)$. By the axiom (E4), m and x_k are O-moves, and n and x_1 are P-moves. Then by the axiom (E3), we conclude that k is even. □

Next, we define the notion of *threads*. In a legal position in an arena, there may be several initial moves; the legal position consists of the chains of justifiers initiated by such initial moves. Those chains are called threads. Formally,

Definition 2.1.22 (Hereditarily justified moves and threads)**.** Let G be an arena, and s a legal position in G. Assume that m is a particular occurrence of a move in s. The **chain of justifiers** from m is a sequence $nx_1x_2 \ldots x_km$ of pointers from m, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{J}(m) = x_k, \mathcal{J}(x_k) = x_{k-1}, \ldots, \mathcal{J}(x_2) = x_1, \mathcal{J}(x_1) = n$$

such that n is initial. In this case, we say that m is **hereditarily justified** by the occurrence n of an initial move. Moreover, the subsequence of s, which consists of the chains of justifiers that end with n, is called a **thread** of n in s.

An occurrence of an initial move is often called an **initial occurrence**. Also,

Notation 2.1.23. We frequently use the following notation:

- We write $s \upharpoonright n$, where s is a legal position of an arena and n is an initial occurrence in s, for the thread of n in s.
- More generally, we write $s \upharpoonright I$, where s is a legal position of an arena and I is a set of initial occurrences in s, for the subsequence of s consisting exactly of threads of initial occurrences in I.

- If s is a legal position and m is an occurrence of a move in s, then we write $\overrightarrow{\mathcal{J}_s}(m)$ for the chain of justifiers from m.

We have a lemma which will be useful later.

Lemma 2.1.24 (Views contain chains)**.** Let G be an arena, and sm a legal position in G. Then,

- if m is a P-move, then $\overrightarrow{\mathcal{J}_{sm}}(m) \sqsubseteq \lceil s \rceil.m$;
- if m is an O-move, then $\overrightarrow{\mathcal{J}_{sm}}(m) \sqsubseteq \lfloor s \rfloor.m$.

Proof. Assume that m is a P-move; the other case can be handled in a similar way. We may write $\overrightarrow{\mathcal{J}_{sm}}(m)$ as

$$nx_{2k}x_{2k-1}\ldots x_1 m$$

where $\mathcal{J}(m) = x_1, \mathcal{J}(x_1) = x_2, \ldots, \mathcal{J}(x_{2k-1}) = x_{2k}, \mathcal{J}(x_{2k}) = n$, and n is initial. We may inductively show $nx_{2k}x_{2k-1}\ldots x_1 \sqsubseteq \lceil s \rceil$ as follows.

- x_1 must be in $\lceil s \rceil$ by the visibility condition.
- Then x_2 is automatically contained in $\lceil s \rceil$ by the definition of the P-view.
- Again, x_3 is in $\lceil s \rceil$ by the visibility condition, and then in turn x_4 is automatically in $\lceil s \rceil$.
- Iterating this process, we may conclude that $nx_{2k}x_{2k-1}\ldots x_1 \sqsubseteq \lceil s \rceil$.

□

We also make the following definition:

Definition 2.1.25 (Complete positions)**.** Let G be an arena. For each natural number $d \in \mathbb{N}$, a legal position $s \in L_G$ is said to be a **complete position of degree** d (or a d**-complete position** for short) if it ends with an external or j-internal move with $j > d$. Moreover, if s is d-complete for all $d \in \mathbb{N}$, then it is called a **fully complete position** (or an ω**-complete position**).

That is, a legal position is d-complete if it ends with a move which is still visible when we apply the operation $\mathcal{H}^d$; it is fully complete if it ends with an external move.

2.1.5 Dynamic Games

Now we are ready to define the notion of *dynamic games*.

Definition 2.1.26 (Dynamic games)**.** A **dynamic game** is a quadruple

$$G = (M_G, \lambda_G, \vdash_G, P_G)$$

where $(M_G, \lambda_G, \vdash_G)$ forms a dynamic arena (also denoted by G), and $P_G \subseteq L_G$ is a set of some legal positions in the arena G, whose elements are called the **valid positions** (also called **plays**) of G, that satisfies:

(V1) P_G is non-empty and prefix-closed.

(V2) If $s \in P_G$ and I is a set of initial occurrences in s, then $s \restriction I \in P_G$.

(V3) If $sm, sm' \in P_G$ with m, m' both internal O-moves, then $m = m'$ and $\mathcal{J}_{sm}(m) = \mathcal{J}_{s'm'}(m')$.

Dynamic games are often called just **games**.

As we shall see shortly, the universe of dynamic games is closed under the operation $\mathcal{H}^\omega$, i.e., hiding all the internal moves. It is in some sense a *coarse* structure; we would like to have the universe of games which is closed under the "one-step" hiding operation $\mathcal{H}$. With this motivation, we now define:

Definition 2.1.27 (Fully dynamic games)**.** A dynamic game G is said to be **fully dynamic** if it satisfies the following two axioms:

- **Fully dynamic legal positions.** $P_G \subseteq L_G^{\mathrm{fd}}$.
- **Generalized (V3).** For all $sm, s'm' \in P_G$, $d \in \mathbb{N}$, if $\mathcal{H}_G^d(s) = \mathcal{H}_G^d(s')$ and m, m' are both j-internal O-moves with $j > d$, then $m = m'$ and $\mathcal{J}_{sm}^{\ominus d}(m) = \mathcal{J}_{s'm'}^{\ominus d}(m')$.

Note that (V3) is a particular case of the generalized (V3): namely when $d = 0$.

Example 2.1.28 (Examples of games)**.** The *empty game* is $I = (\emptyset, \emptyset, \emptyset, \{\epsilon\})$. And the *natural numbers game* is $N = (M_N, \lambda_N, \vdash_N, P_N)$, where $(M_N, \lambda_N, \vdash_N)$ is the natural numbers arena, and

$$P_N \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \{\epsilon, q\} \cup \{q.n \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$$

In comparison with the notion of HO-games defined in [McC98], we additionally required the axiom (V3), which we shall call the **internal O-determinacy**. Note that the concept of dynamic games are a generalization of the HO-games in [McC98]: An HO-game is a dynamic game whose moves are all external. Some of the motivations behind this formulation are as follows:

- To distinguish external and internal moves, we would need just two different labels, but instead we use all natural numbers. This is in order to take into account the *"hierarchical structure in internal moves"*, and exploit it to execute the hiding operation "step-by-step".
- The axiom (E1) states that the first move of a play must be an external Opponent's question: In our notion of games, Opponent always starts a play; an initial move cannot be an answer since there is no question to answer at the beginning; and because internal moves are invisible to Opponent but he has to initiate a play, an initial move must be external.

- The first condition in the axiom (E2) is obvious: an answer must be made for a question. The additional equation in the axiom (E2) ensures that every question-answer pair does not cross a border between an external and internal moves or between internal moves of "different degrees".
- The additional axiom (E4) is required because internal moves are invisible to Opponent, so an external/internal-parity change can be done only by Player. This is applied between internal moves of different degrees too.
- The external subsequences and the external justifiers are the "external analogues" of the justified sequences and the justifiers. Accordingly, we require the external visibility condition.
- The EI- (external/internal)-switch axiom is necessary by the same reason for the axiom (E4).
- The notions of *fully dynamic* arenas and games are more "fine-grained" structures which are closed under the *one-step* hiding operation $\mathcal{H}$, rather than the "once for all" hiding operation $\mathcal{H}^\omega$.

Below, we shall establish the uniqueness of answers, which will be used later. We first need some preliminary definition and lemma.

Definition 2.1.29 (QA-isomorphism and QA-pairs)**.** Let G be an arena, and stu a legal position in G. If every question in t uniquely has its answer in t and every answer in t is for a question in t, then t is said to **have QA-isomorphism** or be **QA-isomorphic**. Moreover, a pair of a question and an answer connected by a QA-isomorphism is called a **QA-pair**.

Lemma 2.1.30 (QA-isomorphic view)**.** Let G be a game and $smtnu \in P_G$. If t is QA-isomorphic, then

- if n is a P-move, then m occurs in $\lceil smt \rceil$;
- if n is an O-move, then m occurs in $\lfloor smt \rfloor$.

Proof. By induction on the length of t. If t is a QA-pair qa, then the claim clearly holds. So assume that t is in the form of

$$t = t_1 q t_2 a$$

where (q, a) is a QA-pair. Then note that both t_1 and t_2 are QA-isomorphic (i.e., there is no pair (q', a') with q' in t_1 and a' in t_2) by the bracketing condition. Thus we have:

- If n is a P-move, then $\lceil smt \rceil = \lceil smt_1 \rceil .qa$, where q is a P-move; so by the induction hypothesis, m occurs in $\lceil smt_1 \rceil$, thus in $\lceil smt \rceil$.
- If n is an O-move, then $\lfloor smt \rfloor = \lfloor smt_1 \rfloor .qa$, where q is an O-move; so by the induction hypothesis, m occurs in $\lfloor smt_1 \rfloor$, thus in $\lfloor smt \rfloor$.

□

Now we prove the uniqueness of answers:

Proposition 2.1.31 (Unique answers)**.** In a play of a game, every question has at most one answer.

Proof. Let G be a game, and $s \in P_G$. We show the claim for s by induction on the length of s.

If $s = \epsilon$, then it is trivial. Thus assume that $s = s'm$. If m is a question, then we may just apply the induction hypothesis. So consider the case where m is an answer a; then there is a question q in s' that is answered by a. Suppose, for a contradiction, that q has another answer a'. Now s is in the form of

$$s = tqua'va$$

By the bracketing condition, there is no pending question in v. Thus by the induction hypothesis, each question in v has its unique answer in v. Also, by the alternation, v must be of odd-length, so it has an answer a_0 which answers a question q_0 in tqu. Without loss of generality, we may assume that a_0 is the rightmost one among such answers.

- If $q_0 = q$, then it contradicts the induction hypothesis.
- If q_0 occurs in t, then t is in the form of $t = t'q_0t''$. Thus we have

  $$s = t'q_0t''qua'v_1a_0v_2a$$

  Note that v_2 is QA-isomorphic; so by Lemma 2.1.30,

  - if a is a P-move, then $\lceil t'q_0t''qua'v_1a_0v_2\rceil = \lceil t'\rceil.q_0a_0.v_2'$ for some v_2', which contradicts the visibility condition for a;
  - if a is an O-move, then $\lfloor t'q_0t''qua'v_1a_0v_2\rfloor = \lfloor t'\rfloor.q_0a_0.v_2'$ for some v_2', which again contradicts the visibility condition for a.

  Therefore in either case we have a contradiction.
- If q_0 occurs in u, then it must have been answered before a' because of the bracketing condition and the pair (q, a'). However, it contradicts the induction hypothesis (the uniqueness of q_0's answer).

We have shown that the supposition $s = tqua'va$ with both a' and a answering q always leads to a contradiction; hence we conclude that this cannot happen, completing the proof. □

2.2 Hiding Operation on Games

In this section, we introduce a fundamental operation on games, which is called the *hiding operation*. The hiding operations on arenas and justified sequences are the preliminary notions to define the operation on games. Roughly speaking, it "hides" all the 1-internal moves and decreases the degree of each internal move by 1; by iterating it, we may hide all the internal moves of the input game. Formally:

Definition 2.2.1 (Hiding operation on games)**.** The **hiding operation** $\mathcal{H}$ on dynamic games is defined as follows: For any dynamic game G, the result $\mathcal{H}(G)$ (also written G^h) of applying $\mathcal{H}$ to G is defined to be the quadruple

$$(M_{\mathcal{H}(G)}, \lambda_{\mathcal{H}(G)}, \vdash_{\mathcal{H}(G)}, P_{\mathcal{H}(G)})$$

where

- The structure $(M_{\mathcal{H}(G)}, \lambda_{\mathcal{H}(G)}, \vdash_{\mathcal{H}(G)})$ is the arena $\mathcal{H}(G)$ (as defined in Definition 2.1.8)
- $P_{\mathcal{H}(G)} \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \{\mathcal{H}_G(s) \mid s \in P_G\}$

As mentioned before, $\mathcal{H}^i$ means the i-times application of $\mathcal{H}$ for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$; in particular $\mathcal{H}^0$ denotes "nothing is applied". Moreover, we write $\mathcal{H}^\omega$ for the countably-infinite times application of $\mathcal{H}$.

We need to show that the hiding operation is well-defined:

Theorem 2.2.2 (Closure of dynamic games under hiding)**.** For any dynamic game G, we have:

1. The structure $\mathcal{H}^\omega(G)$ forms a dynamic game.
2. If G is fully dynamic, then the structure $\mathcal{H}(G)$ forms a fully dynamic game.
3. Moreover, $\mathcal{H}^i(G)$ forms a dynamic game for all natural numbers $i \in \mathbb{N}$ if and only if G is fully dynamic.

Proof. We first show the clause 2; assume G is fully dynamic. By Lemma 2.1.9, it suffices to show $P_{\mathcal{H}(G)}$ is a subset of $L_{\mathcal{H}(G)}$ and satisfies the axioms (V1), (V2) and generalized (V3).

We first show $P_{\mathcal{H}(G)} \subseteq L_{\mathcal{H}(G)}$, i.e., verify the justification, alternation, bracketing, generalized visibility, and EI-switch conditions for all $s \in P_{\mathcal{H}(G)}$.

Justification. It has been already shown as Lemma 2.1.11.

Alternation. Assume $s_1xys_2 \in P_{\mathcal{H}(G)}$; we have to show $\lambda^{\mathrm{OP}}_{\mathcal{H}(G)}(x) \neq \lambda^{\mathrm{OP}}_{\mathcal{H}(G)}(y)$. We have some $t_1xz_1 \dots z_kyt_2 \in P_G$ such that

$$\mathcal{H}(t_1xz_1 \dots z_kyt_2) = s_1xys_2$$

where $\mathcal{H}(t_1) = s_1, \mathcal{H}(z_1 \dots z_k) = \epsilon, \mathcal{H}(t_2) = s_2$. Note that $\lambda^{\mathbb{N}}_G(x) = \lambda^{\mathbb{N}}_G(y) \neq 1$ and $\lambda^{\mathbb{N}}_G(z_i) = 1$ for $i = 1, \dots, k$. So by Lemma 2.1.21, the integer k must be an even number. Hence,

$$\lambda^{\mathrm{OP}}_{\mathcal{H}(G)}(x) = \lambda^{\mathrm{OP}}_G(x) = \lambda^{\mathrm{OP}}_G(z_2) = \lambda^{\mathrm{OP}}_G(z_4) = \cdots = \lambda^{\mathrm{OP}}_G(z_k) \neq \lambda^{\mathrm{OP}}_G(y) = \lambda^{\mathrm{OP}}_{\mathcal{H}(G)}(y)$$

Bracketing. Let $s_1ns_2m \in P_{\mathcal{H}(G)}$ with m justified by n, and $\lambda^{\mathrm{QA}}_{\mathcal{H}(G)}(m) = \mathrm{A}$. Then we have some $t_1nt_2mt_3 \in P_G$, satisfying

$$s_1ns_2m = \mathcal{H}(t_1nt_2mt_3) = \mathcal{H}(t_1).n.\mathcal{H}(t_2).m.\mathcal{H}(t_3)$$

Thus, $t_1nt_2m \in P_G$ such that $\mathcal{H}(t_1nt_2m) = s_1ns_2m$.

For t_1nt_2m, if m has its justifier $n' \stackrel{\mathrm{df.}}{=} \mathcal{J}_G(m)$ in t_2 (so in particular $n \neq n'$), then $\lambda^{\mathbb{N}}_G(n') = \lambda^{\mathbb{N}}_G(m) \neq 1$ by the axiom (E2) for G (note that n' cannot be in t_1). Thus $n' \in M_{\mathcal{H}(G)}$ and so m would be justified by n' in s_1ns_2m, a contradiction. Thus, m must be justified by n in t_1nt_2m. Note that t_1nt_2m satisfies the bracketing condition (with respect to G); thus in particular n is the last pending question for m in t_1nt_2m; thus it is so in $s_1ns_2m = \mathcal{H}(t_1).n.\mathcal{H}(t_2).m$ as well.

Generalized visibility. Let $tmu \in P_{\mathcal{H}(G)}$ with m non-initial. We have to show, for each $d \in \mathbb{N}$, that if m is external or j-internal with $j > d$, then:

- if m is a P-move, then the justifier $(\mathcal{J}_s^{\ominus 1})^{\ominus d}(m)$ occurs in $\lceil \mathcal{H}^d_{G^h}(t) \rceil_{\mathcal{H}^d(G^h)}$;
- if m is an O-move, then the justifier $(\mathcal{J}_s^{\ominus 1})^{\ominus d}(m)$ occurs in $\lfloor \mathcal{H}^d_{G^h}(t) \rfloor_{\mathcal{H}^d(G^h)}$.

which is equivalent to

- if m is a P-move, then the justifier $\mathcal{J}_s^{\ominus (d+1)}(m)$ occurs in $\lceil \mathcal{H}^{d+1}_G(t') \rceil_{\mathcal{H}^{d+1}(G)}$;
- if m is an O-move, then the justifier $\mathcal{J}_s^{\ominus (d+1)}(m)$ occurs in $\lfloor \mathcal{H}^{d+1}_G(t') \rfloor_{\mathcal{H}^{d+1}(G)}$.

where $t' \in P_G$ with $\mathcal{H}_G(t') = t$ (note that some $t'm \in P_G$ with $\mathcal{H}_G(t'm) = tm$ must exist) by Proposition 2.1.12. This clearly holds by the generalized visibility for G.

EI-switch. Assume that $s \in P_{\mathcal{H}(G)}$ is in the form $s = s_1mns_2$ such that $\lambda^{\mathbb{N}}_{\mathcal{H}(G)}(m) \neq \lambda^{\mathbb{N}}_{\mathcal{H}(G)}(n)$. We may write $s = \mathcal{H}_G(t)$ for some $t = t_1mt_2nt_3 \in P_G$. If $t_2 \neq \epsilon$, then it can be handled in the same was as the alternation condition. If $t_2 = \epsilon$, then note that $\lambda^{\mathbb{N}}_G(m) \neq \lambda^{\mathbb{N}}_G(n)$. Thus,

$$\lambda^{\mathrm{OP}}_{\mathcal{H}(G)}(m) = \lambda^{\mathrm{OP}}_G(m) = \mathrm{O}$$
$$\lambda^{\mathrm{OP}}_{\mathcal{H}(G)}(n) = \lambda^{\mathrm{OP}}_G(n) = \mathrm{P}$$

Therefore we have established $P_{\mathcal{H}(G)} \subseteq L_{\mathcal{H}(G)}$. Now, we need to verify the three axioms for $P_{\mathcal{H}(G)}$.

- **(V1)** Because $\epsilon \in P_G$, we have $\epsilon = \mathcal{H}(\epsilon) \in P_{\mathcal{H}(G)}$; so $P_{\mathcal{H}(G)}$ is non-empty. For the prefix-closure, let $sm \in P_{\mathcal{H}(G)}$; we have to show $s \in P_{\mathcal{H}(G)}$. Again, there is some $tm \in P_G$ such that $sm = \mathcal{H}(tm) = \mathcal{H}(t).m$; also $t \in P_G$. Thus we conclude $s = \mathcal{H}(t) \in P_{\mathcal{H}(G)}$.

- **(V2)** Let $s \in P_{\mathcal{H}(G)}$ and I a set of initial moves occurring in s; we have to show $s \restriction I \in P_{\mathcal{H}(G)}$. There is some $t \in P_G$ with $s = \mathcal{H}(t)$. Note that $t \restriction I \in P_G$, and every initial move is external. Thus we have:

$$s \restriction I = \mathcal{H}(t) \restriction I = \mathcal{H}(t \restriction I) \in P_{\mathcal{H}(G)}$$

- **Generalized (V3)** Assume $sm, s'm' \in P_{\mathcal{H}(G)}$, $d \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathcal{H}^d_{G^h}(s) = \mathcal{H}^d_{G^h}(s')$ and m, m' are both j-internal O-moves in $\mathcal{H}(G)$ with $j > d$. Then there are some $tm, t'm' \in P_G$ such that $\mathcal{H}_G(t) = s$ and $\mathcal{H}_G(t') = s'$. Note that m, m' are both $(j+1)$-internal in G with $j + 1 > d + 1$, and

  $$\mathcal{H}^{d+1}_G(t) = \mathcal{H}^d_{G^h}(\mathcal{H}_G(t)) = \mathcal{H}^d_{G^h}(s) = \mathcal{H}^d_{G^h}(s') = \mathcal{H}^d_{G^h}(\mathcal{H}_G(t')) = \mathcal{H}^{d+1}_G(t')$$

  Hence by the generalized (V3) axiom for G, we conclude that $m = m'$ and

  $$\mathcal{J}^{\ominus d}_{sm}(m) = \mathcal{J}^{\ominus(d+1)}_{tm}(m) = \mathcal{J}^{\ominus(d+1)}_{t'm'}(m') = \mathcal{J}^{\ominus d}_{s'm'}(m')$$

  which establishes the generalized (V3) for $\mathcal{H}(G)$.

We have established the clause 2. Notice that in the above, we have used the assumption of G being fully dynamic just for the generalized visibility and the generalized (V3). Thus, to show the clause 1, assuming G is not necessarily fully dynamic, it suffices to establish the visibility, external visibility, and (V3) for $\mathcal{H}^\omega(G)$.

- **Visibility.** The visibility for $\mathcal{H}^\omega(G)$ is equivalent to the external visibility for G, so we are done.

- **External visibility.** Since there are no internal moves in $\mathcal{H}(G)$, the external visibility is just the same as the visibility, which has already been established.

- **(V3).** It trivially holds since there are no internal moves in $\mathcal{H}^\omega(G)$.

It remains to establish the clause 3. The sufficiency immediately follows from the clause 2. And the necessity is just by the definition. □

It is then immediate that:

Corollary 2.2.3 (Well-defined generalized hiding on games)**.** For any fully dynamic game G, the structure $\mathcal{H}^d(G)$, for each $d \in \mathbb{N}$, is a well-defined fully dynamic game.

Proof. By the clause 2 of Theorem 2.2.2. □

Now, we aim to characterize the "iterated" hiding operation:

Definition 2.2.4 (Generalized hiding on games)**.** The *d*-**hiding operation** $\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^d$, for each natural number $d \in \mathbb{N}$, on dynamic games is defined as follows: For any dynamic game G, the structure $\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^d(G)$ is defined to be the quadruple

$$(M_{\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^d(G)}, \lambda_{\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^d(G)}, \vdash_{\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^d(G)}, P_{\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^d(G)})$$

where

- $M_{\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^d(G)} \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \{m \in M_G \mid \lambda^{\mathbb{N}}_G(m) = 0 \vee \lambda^{\mathbb{N}}_G(m) > d\}$
- $\lambda_{\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^d(G)} \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \lambda_G^{\ominus d} \restriction M_{\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^d(G)}$
- The enabling relation is defined by

$$m \vdash_{\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^d(G)} n \stackrel{\text{df.}}{\Leftrightarrow} \exists k \in \mathbb{N}, \exists x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{2k} \in M_G^{\geqslant 1} \cap M_G^{\leqslant d}.\, m \vdash_G x_1,$$
$$x_1 \vdash_G x_2, \ldots, x_{2k-1} \vdash_G x_{2k}, x_{2k} \vdash_G n$$

  where the case $k = 0 \wedge m \vdash_G n$ is included.

- $P_{\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^d(G)} \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \{\mathcal{H}^d_G(s) \mid s \in P_G\}$

Notice that the usual hiding operation coincides with the 1-hiding operation, i.e., $\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^1 = \mathcal{H}$. Now we establish the characterization:

Proposition 2.2.5 (Generalized hiding as iterated hiding)**.** For every natural number $i \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^{i+1}(G) = \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^1(\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^i(G))$$

Hence, it follows that $\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^i = \mathcal{H}^i$ (i.e., the i-times iteration of $\mathcal{H}$) for all natural numbers $i \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. We verify that the components are exactly the same. First, for the sets of moves, observe that

$$\begin{aligned} M_{\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^{i+1}(G)} &= \{m \in M_G \mid \lambda^{\mathbb{N}}_G(m) = 0 \vee \lambda^{\mathbb{N}}_G(m) > i+1\} \\ &= \{m \in M_{\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^i(G)} \mid \lambda^{\mathbb{N}}_G(m) = 0 \vee \lambda^{\mathbb{N}}_G(m) > i+1\} \\ &= \{m \in M_{\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^i(G)} \mid \lambda^{\mathbb{N}}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^i(G)}(m) = 0 \vee \lambda^{\mathbb{N}}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^i(G)}(m) > 1\} \\ &= M_{\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}(\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^i(G))} \end{aligned}$$

Also, the labeling functions clearly coincide:

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^{i+1}(G)} &= \lambda_G^{\ominus(i+1)} \restriction M_{\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^{i+1}(G)} \\ &= (\lambda_G^{\ominus i} \restriction M_{\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^i(G)})^{\ominus 1} \restriction M_{\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}(\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^i(G))} \\ &= \lambda^{\ominus 1}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^i(G)} \restriction M_{\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}(\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^i(G))} \\ &= \lambda^{\ominus 1}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}(\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^i(G))} \end{aligned}$$

For the enabling relations, notice that

$$\begin{aligned}
m \vdash_{\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^{i+1}(G)} n \Leftrightarrow\ & \exists k \in \mathbb{N}, \exists x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{2k} \in M_G^{\geqslant 1} \cap M_G^{\leqslant i+1}.\, m \vdash_G x_1, \\
& x_1 \vdash_G x_2, \ldots, x_{2k-1} \vdash_G x_{2k}, x_{2k} \vdash_G n \\
\Leftrightarrow\ & (m \vdash_{\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^i(G)} n) \vee (\exists l \in \mathbb{N}^+, \exists x_{2j_1-1}, x_{2j_1}, x_{2j_2-1}, x_{2j_2}, \ldots, \\
& x_{2j_l-1}, x_{2j_l} \in M_G^{i+1}.\, m \vdash_{\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^i(G)} x_{2j_1-1},\ x_{2j_1-1} \vdash_{\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^i(G)} x_{2j_1}, \\
& x_{2j_1} \vdash_{\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^i(G)} x_{2j_2-1}, x_{2j_2-1} \vdash_{\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^i(G)} x_{2j_2}, \ldots, x_{2j_l-1} \vdash_{\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^i(G)} x_{2j_l}, \\
& x_{2j_l} \vdash_{\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^i(G)} n) \\
\Leftrightarrow\ & (m \vdash_{\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^i(G)} n) \vee (\exists l \in \mathbb{N}^+, \exists y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_{2l} \in M^1_{\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^i(G)}.\, m \vdash_{\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^i(G)} y_1, \\
& y_1 \vdash_{\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^i(G)} y_2, \ldots, y_{2l-1} \vdash_{\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^i(G)} y_{2l}, y_{2l} \vdash_{\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^i(G)} n) \\
\Leftrightarrow\ & m \vdash_{\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}(\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^i(G))} n
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, we show, by induction on i, that $P_{\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^{i+1}(G)} = P_{\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}(\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^i(G))}$. The base case $i + 0$ is trivial. For $i \geqslant 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
P_{\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^{i+1}(G)} &= \{\mathcal{H}_G^{i+1}(s) \mid s \in P_G\} \\
&= \{\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{H}^i(G)}(\mathcal{H}_G^i(s)) \mid s \in P_G\} \text{ (by Proposition 2.1.12)} \\
&= \{\mathcal{H}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^i(G)}(t) \mid t \in P_{\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^i(G)}\} \text{ (by the induction hypothesis)} \\
&= P_{\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}(\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^i(G))}
\end{aligned}$$

□

Due to the proposition, from now on, we shall not use the notation $\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^d$; but we shall regard the d-hiding operation defined in Definition 2.2.4 as another characterization of the d-times iteration of the hiding operation $\mathcal{H}$.

We have a useful corollary:

Corollary 2.2.6 (Hiding on legal positions)**.** For any dynamic arena G, we have the following two equations:

1. $\{\mathcal{H}_G^\omega(s) \mid s \in L_G\} = L_{\mathcal{H}^\omega(G)}$
2. $\{\mathcal{H}_G^i(s) \mid s \in L_G^{\mathrm{fd}}\} = L^{\mathrm{fd}}_{\mathcal{H}^i(G)}$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$

Proof. We show only the equation 2; it is analogous to establish the equation 1. Notice that, with Propositions 2.1.12 and 2.2.5, by induction on i, it suffices to verify it just for $i = 1$.

The inclusion $\{\mathcal{H}(s) \mid s \in L_G^{\mathrm{fd}}\} \subseteq L^{\mathrm{fd}}_{G^h}$ is immediate by Theorem 2.2.2. For the other inclusion, let $t \in L^{\mathrm{fd}}_{G^h}$. We shall find some $s \in L_G^{\mathrm{fd}}$ such that

1. $\mathcal{H}(s) = t$;
2. All the 1-internal moves in s occur as even-length consecutive segments $x_1 x_2 \ldots x_{2k}$, where x_i justifies x_{i+1} $(i = 1, \ldots, 2k-1)$; and

3. The last move of s is not 1-internal.

We proceed by induction on the length of t. The case $t = \epsilon$ is trivial.

Let $tm \in L^{\mathrm{fd}}_{G^h}$. Then $t \in L^{\mathrm{fd}}_{G^h}$, and by the induction hypothesis there is some $s \in L^{\mathrm{fd}}_G$ that satisfies the three conditions.

If m is initial, then it is straightforward to see that $sm \in L^{\mathrm{fd}}_G$, and sm satisfies the three conditions. Thus, assume that m is non-initial; we may write

$$tm = t_1 n t_2 m$$

where m is justified by n. We then need a case analysis:

- Assume that $n \vdash_G m$. Then we take sm, in which m points to n.

  Then, we have $sm \in L^{\mathrm{fd}}_G$ because:

  - **Justification.** It is immediate because $n \vdash_G m$.
  - **Alternation.** By the condition 3 for s, the last moves of s and t coincide. Thus the alternation condition holds for sm.
  - **Bracketing.** By $tm \in L^{\mathrm{fd}}_{G^h}$ and the condition 2 for s, there is no pending question between n and m in s, establishing the bracketing condition for sm.
  - **Generalized visibility.** It suffices to establish the visibility for sm, as the other cases are included as the general visibility for tm. It is straightforward to see that, by the condition 2 for s, if the view of t contains n, then so does the view of s. And since $tm \in L^{\mathrm{fd}}_{G^h}$, the view of t contains n. Hence, the view of s contains n as well.
  - **EI-switch.** Again, the last moves of s and t are the same by the condition 3 for s; so the EI-switch condition for tm can be directly applied.

  Also, it is easy to see that sm satisfies the three conditions.

- Assume that $n \neq \star$ and $\exists k \in \mathbb{N}^+, \exists x_1, \ldots, x_{2k} \in M^1_G$ such that

  $$n \vdash_G x_1, x_1 \vdash_G x_2, \ldots, x_{2k-1} \vdash_G x_{2k}, x_{2k} \vdash_G m$$

  We then take $sx_1 \ldots x_{2k}m$, in which x_1 points to n, x_i points to x_{i-1} $(i = 2, 3, \ldots, 2k)$, and m points to x_{2k}. Then $sx_1 \ldots x_{2k}m \in L^{\mathrm{fd}}_G$ because:

  - **Justification.** Obvious.
  - **Alternation.** By the condition 3 for s, the last moves of s and t coincide. Thus the alternation condition holds for $sx_1 \ldots x_{2k}m$.
  - **Bracketing.** Again, it is immediate by $tm \in L^{\mathrm{fd}}_{G^h}$ and the condition 2 for s.
  - **Generalized visibility.** By the same argument as the above case.
  - **EI-switch.** It clearly holds by the axiom (E4).

  And it is easy to see that $sx_1 \ldots x_{2k}m$ satisfies the three conditions.

□

2.3 Explicit Games and External Equality

Note that a game G has no internal moves if and only if $\mathcal{H}^\omega(G) = G$. Such a game is called *explicit*, since all the moves are visible for everyone.

Definition 2.3.1 (Explicit games)**.** A game G is called **explicit** if $\mathcal{H}^\omega(G) = G$ (or equivalently $\lambda_G^{\mathbb{N}}(m) = 0$ for all $m \in M_G$).

Definition 2.3.2 (External equality between games)**.** Games A and B are said to be **externally equal** and written $A \approx B$ if $\mathcal{H}^\omega(A) = \mathcal{H}^\omega(B)$.

2.4 Constructions on Games

In this section, we incorporate various constructions on games in the literature (see [McC98]) into the universe of (fully) dynamic games, as well as some of the new constructions.

First, we introduce some notation:

Notation 2.4.1. In the following, we shall frequently encounter the situations, where we have a justified sequence s in an arena G with a component arena H, and would like to take the subsequence of s consisting exactly of H-moves, which may form a justified sequence in H; e.g., $G = A \multimap B$ and $H = A$. We then write $s \upharpoonright H$ for that subsequence, i.e., $s \upharpoonright H$ is defined to be the subsequence of s consisting exactly of H-moves, in which the "tags" for moves due to the disjoint union when forming G are removed, and the pointers to non-H-moves are handled in the same way as how pointers to 1-internal moves are changed by the hiding operation. Similarly, we write $s \downharpoonright H$ for the subsequence of s consisting exactly of the non-H-moves, in which the tags and pointers are handled in the same way.

2.4.1 Tensor Product

We begin with the *tensor product* of games. Conceptually, the tensor product $A \otimes B$ is the game in which the component games A and B are played "in parallel without communication".

Definition 2.4.2 (Tensor product [AJ94, McC98])**.** Given games A and B, we define their **tensor product** $A \otimes B$ as follows:

- $M_{A\otimes B} \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} M_A + M_B$
- $\lambda_{A\otimes B} \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} [\lambda_A, \lambda_B]$
- $\vdash_{A\otimes B} \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \vdash_A \cup \vdash_B$
- $P_{A\otimes B} \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \{s \in L_{A\otimes B} \mid s \upharpoonright A \in P_A, s \upharpoonright B \in P_B\}$

Before proving that the above structure is a well-defined dynamic game, we need some lemmata:

Lemma 2.4.3 (Switching lemma for tensor product [A$^+$97, McC98])**.** Let A and B be games, and assume $smnt \in P_{A\otimes B}$. If one of m or n is in M_A and the other is in M_B, then $\lambda^{\mathrm{OP}}_{A\otimes B}(m) = \mathrm{P}$ and $\lambda^{\mathrm{OP}}_{A\otimes B}(n) = \mathrm{O}$.

Proof. See [A$^+$97]. □

Note that Lemma 2.4.3 does not say anything about a P-move followed by an O-move: If $smnt \in P_{A\otimes B}$ with $\lambda^{\mathrm{OP}}_{A\otimes B}(m) = \mathrm{P}$ and $\lambda^{\mathrm{OP}}_{A\otimes B}(n) = \mathrm{O}$, then they may belong to the same component game or different component games. However, if they are both internal, then we may guarantee that they belong to the same component game:

Lemma 2.4.4 (Internal switching lemma for tensor product)**.** Let A and B be games, and assume $smnt \in P_{A\otimes B}$. If m and n are internal P- and O-moves, respectively, then they belong to the same component game.

Proof. Consider all the possible sequence of $P_{A\otimes B}$ in terms of the parities OP (Opponent or Player) and EI (external or internal). We denote $(A^{A_{\mathrm{EI}}}_{\mathrm{OP}}, B^{B_{\mathrm{EI}}}_{\mathrm{OP}})$ when the next possible move of A (resp. B) has the OP-parity A_{OP} (resp. B_{OP}) and the EI-parity A_{EI} (resp. B_{EI}).

We first claim that, in a play of the game $A \otimes B$, if the current state is $(\mathrm{O}^{\mathrm{E}}, \mathrm{O}^{\mathrm{E}})$ and the next move is a B-move, then there are just two patterns for a sequence of the parities to come back to the state again:

b_1. $(\mathrm{O}^{\mathrm{E}}, \mathrm{O}^{\mathrm{E}}) \rightleftarrows (\mathrm{O}^{\mathrm{E}}, \mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{E}})$

b_2. $(\mathrm{O}^{\mathrm{E}}, \mathrm{O}^{\mathrm{E}}) \to (\mathrm{O}^{\mathrm{E}}, \mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{I}}) \rightleftarrows (\mathrm{O}^{\mathrm{E}}, \mathrm{O}^{\mathrm{I}}) \to (\mathrm{O}^{\mathrm{E}}, \mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{E}}) \rightleftarrows (\mathrm{O}^{\mathrm{E}}, \mathrm{O}^{\mathrm{E}})$

Similarly, in the same state, if the next move is an A-move, then there are also just two patterns:

a_1. $(\mathrm{O}^{\mathrm{E}}, \mathrm{O}^{\mathrm{E}}) \rightleftarrows (\mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{E}}, \mathrm{O}^{\mathrm{E}})$

a_2. $(\mathrm{O}^{\mathrm{E}}, \mathrm{O}^{\mathrm{E}}) \to (\mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{I}}, \mathrm{O}^{\mathrm{E}}) \rightleftarrows (\mathrm{O}^{\mathrm{I}}, \mathrm{O}^{\mathrm{E}}) \to (\mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{E}}, \mathrm{O}^{\mathrm{E}}) \rightleftarrows (\mathrm{O}^{\mathrm{E}}, \mathrm{O}^{\mathrm{E}})$

This is summarized as Table 1. That is, the parity sequence of a play of the game $A \otimes B$ must follow the transition of the table, which clearly establishes the lemma. We shall show the claim for B; the one for A is analogous.

1. Assume that the current state is $(\mathrm{O}^{\mathrm{E}}, \mathrm{O}^{\mathrm{E}})$. If the next move is a B-move, then it may be external or internal, corresponding to the pattern b_1 or b_2, respectively.

2. If it is an external P-move of B (the pattern b_1), then the next move must be an external O-move of B by the alternation and EI-switch conditions. Thus we have come back to the initial state.

3. If it is an internal P-move of B (the pattern b_2), then the next move must be an internal O-move of B again by the alternation and EI-switch conditions (note that the state of A is O_{E}, so we cannot take an A-move at this stage). In this case, the next move can be either an internal P-move of B or an external P-move of B.



Table 1: The double parity diagram

4. In either case, the state will be back to a previous one, arriving at the conclusion that there are only two possible patterns.

□

Now we are ready to establish the following:

Proposition 2.4.5 (Well-defined tensor product)**.** For any dynamic games A and B, the structure $A \otimes B$ forms a well-defined dynamic game.

Proof. All the axioms required for the usual notion of games have been shown in the literature (cf. [McC98]). Thus it remains to show the preservation property of the additional conditions in (E1), (E2), (E4) and (V3).

- **(E1)** Assume $\star \vdash_{A\otimes B} m$; then $\star \vdash_A m$ or $\star \vdash_B m$. If $\star \vdash_A m$, then $\lambda_{A\otimes B}(m) = \lambda_A(m) = \mathrm{OQ0}$; and if $\star \vdash_B m$, then $\lambda_{A\otimes B}(m) = \lambda_B(m) = \mathrm{OQ0}$.

- **(E2)** Assume $m \vdash_{A\otimes B} n$ and $\lambda^{\mathrm{QA}}_{A\otimes B}(n) = \mathrm{A}$. Then $m \vdash_A n$ or $m \vdash_B n$. If $m \vdash_A n$, then $\lambda^{\mathrm{QA}}_A(n) = \mathrm{A}$, and so

$$\lambda^{\mathrm{QA}}_{A\otimes B}(m) = \lambda^{\mathrm{QA}}_A(m) = \mathrm{Q}$$
$$\lambda^{\mathbb{N}}_{A\otimes B}(m) = \lambda^{\mathbb{N}}_A(m) = \lambda^{\mathbb{N}}_A(n) = \lambda^{\mathbb{N}}_{A\otimes B}(n)$$

  The case $m \vdash_B n$ is analogous.

- **(E4)** It is immediate by the definition of the tensor product.

- **(V3)** Assume $smn, smn' \in P_{A\otimes B}$, where n and n' are internal O-moves. Note that m must be an internal P-move. Then by Lemma 2.4.4, m, n, n' all belong to the same component game. If they are all A-moves, then we have $(s \upharpoonright A).mn, (s \upharpoonright A).mn' \in P_A$; so by (V3) for A, we have $n = n'$ and $\mathcal{J}_{smn}(n) = \mathcal{J}_{(s\upharpoonright A).mn}(n) = \mathcal{J}_{(s\upharpoonright A).mn'}(n') = \mathcal{J}_{smn'}(n')$. The case in which m, n, n' are all B-moves is analogous.

□

Here we present a technical lemma.

Lemma 2.4.6 (Independent view in tensor products)**.** Let A and B be games. Then for any valid position $sm \in P_{A \otimes B}$ of their tensor $A \otimes B$, we have

$$\lceil sm \rceil = \begin{cases} \lceil sm \upharpoonright A \rceil & \text{if } m \in M_A \\ \lceil sm \upharpoonright B \rceil & \text{if } m \in M_B \end{cases}$$

Proof. See Appendix A.1. □

Remark 2.4.7. We do not have, for each $sm \in P_{A \otimes B}$, the following symmetric equation:

$$\lfloor sm \rfloor = \begin{cases} \lfloor sm \upharpoonright A \rfloor & \text{if } m \in M_A \\ \lfloor sm \upharpoonright B \rfloor & \text{if } m \in M_B \end{cases}$$

Naturally, we may consider the tensor product on fully dynamic games, though it will not play a major role in the rest of the paper.

Definition 2.4.8 (Fully dynamic tensor product)**.** Given fully dynamic games A and B, we define their **fully dynamic tensor product** $A \boxtimes B$ by:

- The arena $A \boxtimes B$ is the arena $A \otimes B$.
- $P_{A \boxtimes B} \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \{s \in L^{\text{fd}}_{A \otimes B} \mid s \upharpoonright A \in P_A, s \upharpoonright B \in P_B\}$

In a completely analogous way, we may establish:

Proposition 2.4.9 (Well-defined fully dynamic tensor product)**.** For any fully dynamic games A and B, their fully dynamic tensor product $A \boxtimes B$ forms a fully dynamic game.

Proof. Similar to the proof of Proposition 2.4.5. □

2.4.2 Linear Implication

Because of the axiom (V3), the universe of dynamic games is not closed under the usual *linear implication* (see [McC98]); we need to require that the domain A of a linear implication $A \multimap B$ to be explicit.

Conceptually, it makes sense because Player behaves as Opponent in the component game A who cannot see any internal moves.

Definition 2.4.10 (Linear implication [AJ94, McC98])**.** Given an explicit game A and a game B, we define their **linear implication** $A \multimap B$ as follows:

- $M_{A \multimap B} \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} M_A + M_B$
- $\lambda_{A \multimap B} \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} [\overline{\lambda_A}, \lambda_B]$
- $\star \vdash_{A \multimap B} m \stackrel{\text{df.}}{\Leftrightarrow} \star \vdash_B m$
- $m \vdash_{A \multimap B} n \ (m \neq \star) \stackrel{\text{df.}}{\Leftrightarrow} (m \vdash_A n) \vee (m \vdash_B n) \vee (\star \vdash_B m \wedge \star \vdash_A n)$

- $P_{A \multimap B} \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \{s \in L_{A \multimap B} \mid s \upharpoonright A \in P_A, s \upharpoonright B \in P_B\}$

Before proving that the above structure is a well-defined game, we need the following lemma:

Lemma 2.4.11 (Switching lemma for $\multimap$ [A$^+$97, McC98])**.** Let A and B be games, and assume $smnt \in P_{A \multimap B}$. If one of m or n is in M_A and the other is in M_B, then $\lambda^{\mathrm{OP}}_{A \multimap B}(m) = \mathrm{O}$ and $\lambda^{\mathrm{OP}}_{A \multimap B}(n) = \mathrm{P}$.

Proof. See [A$^+$97]. □

Now we establish:

Proposition 2.4.12 (Well-defined linear implication)**.** For any explicit game A and dynamic game B, the structure $A \multimap B$ forms a well-defined dynamic game.

Proof. Again, it suffices to show the preservation property of the additional conditions in (E1), (E2), (E4) and (V3).

- **(E1)** If $\star \vdash_{A \multimap B} m$, then $\star \vdash_B m$. Thus $\lambda_{A \multimap B}(m) = \lambda_B(m) = \mathrm{OQ0}$.
- **(E2)** Assume $m \vdash_{A \multimap B} n$ and $\lambda^{\mathrm{QA}}_{A \multimap B}(n) = \mathrm{A}$. Then $m \vdash_A n$ or $m \vdash_B n$ (note that the case of $\star \vdash_B m \wedge \star \vdash_A n$ cannot happen). If $m \vdash_A n$, then $\lambda^{\mathrm{QA}}_A(n) = \lambda^{\mathrm{QA}}_{A \multimap B}(n) = \mathrm{A}$, and so
$$\lambda^{\mathrm{QA}}_{A \multimap B}(m) = \lambda^{\mathrm{QA}}_A(m) = \mathrm{Q}$$
$$\lambda^{\mathbb{N}}_{A \multimap B}(m) = \lambda^{\mathbb{N}}_A(m) = \lambda^{\mathbb{N}}_A(n) = \lambda^{\mathbb{N}}_{A \multimap B}(n)$$
The case $m \vdash_B n$ is analogous.
- **(E4)** Since A is explicit, it is immediate by the definition of the linear implication.
- **(V3)** Assume $smn, smn' \in P_{A \multimap B}$, where n, n' are internal O-moves. Note that m must be an internal P-move. Then since A is explicit, m, n, n' are all B-moves. Thus it can be handled in the same way as the tensor product.

□

Again, we may consider a linear implication on fully dynamic games:

Definition 2.4.13 (Fully dynamic linear implication)**.** Given an explicit game A and a fully dynamic game B, their **fully dynamic linear implication** $A \rightsquigarrow B$ is defined by

- The arena $A \rightsquigarrow B$ is the arena $A \multimap B$.
- $P_{A \rightsquigarrow B} \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \{s \in L^{\mathrm{fd}}_{A \multimap B} \mid s \upharpoonright A \in P_A, s \upharpoonright B \in P_B\}$

Proposition 2.4.14 (Well-defined fully dynamic linear implication)**.** For any explicit game A and fully dynamic game B, their fully dynamic linear implication $A \rightsquigarrow B$ forms a fully dynamic game.

Proof. Similar to the proof of Proposition 2.4.12. □

2.4.3 Product

The construction of *products* is a categorical product in the cartesian closed category of games and strategies in the HO-games (see [McC98]).

Definition 2.4.15 (Product [HO00, McC98])**.** Given games A and B, we define their **product** $A\&B$ as follows:

- $M_{A\&B} \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} M_A + M_B$
- $\lambda_{A\&B} \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} [\lambda_A, \lambda_B]$
- $\vdash_{A\&B} \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \vdash_A \cup \vdash_B$
- $P_{A\&B}$

  $\stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \{s \in L_{A\&B} \mid s \restriction A \in P_A, s \restriction B = \epsilon\} \cup \{s \in L_{A\&B} \mid s \restriction A = \epsilon, s \restriction B \in P_B\}$
  $(\cong P_A + P_B)$

As expected, we have:

Proposition 2.4.16 (Well-defined product)**.** For any (resp. fully) dynamic games A and B, the structure $A\&B$ forms a well-defined (resp. fully) dynamic game.

Proof. We first assume that A and B are both dynamic but not necessarily fully dynamic. Again, it suffices to show the preservation property of the additional conditions in (E1), (E2), (E4) and (V3).

- **(E1)** If $\star \vdash_{A\&B} m$, then $\star \vdash_A m$ or $\star \vdash_B m$. Thus it can be dealt with in the same way as the tensor product $A \otimes B$.
- **(E2)** Again, it can be dealt with in the same way as the tensor product $A \otimes B$.
- **(E4)** It is immediate by the definition of the product.
- **(V3)** Assume $smn, smn' \in P_{A\&B}$, where n, n' are internal O-moves. By the definition, we have either $smn, smn' \in P_A$ or $smn, smn' \in P_B$ (here we ignore the tags for the disjoint union). In either case, the axiom (V3) for a component game can be directly applied.

Finally, we consider the case in which A and B are both fully dynamic. Then, in the same way, we may show that their product $A\&B$ is fully dynamic. □

Remark 2.4.17. Notice that, unlike tensor product and linear implication, the construction of product remains the same both on dynamic games and fully dynamic games. This property holds for exponentials, external interaction, etc., which will be used to form a cartesian closed structure on the category of games and strategies later. Thus, in some sense, these notions are more robust than the two former constructions.

Now, we develop a trivial generalization of the product, which will be necessary to formulate the bicategory of dynamic games and strategies later:

Definition 2.4.18 (Tailed product)**.** Given dynamic games J, K such that $\mathcal{H}^\omega(J) = C \multimap A$, $\mathcal{H}^\omega(K) = C \multimap B$, where A, B, C are explicit games, we define their **tailed product** $J \&^C K$ on C as follows:

- $M_{J\&^C K} \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} M_C + (M_J \backslash M_C) + (M_K \backslash M_C)$
- $\lambda_{J\&^C K} \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} [\overline{\lambda_C}, \lambda_J, \lambda_K] \restriction M_{J\&^C K}$
- The enabling relation is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \vdash_{J\&^C K} \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} (\vdash_C \cup \vdash_J \cup \vdash_K) \cap [(\{\star\} + M_{J\&^C K}) \times M_{J\&^C K}] \\ \cup \{(m, c) \mid \star \vdash_C c, \star \vdash_J m \vee \star \vdash_K m\} \end{aligned}$$

- The valid positions are defined by

$$\begin{aligned} P_{J\&^C K} \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \{s \in L_{J\&^C K} \mid s \restriction C, J \in P_J, s \restriction B = \epsilon\} \\ \cup \{s \in L_{J\&^C K} \mid s \restriction C, K \in P_K, s \restriction A = \epsilon\} \end{aligned}$$

Note that the tailed product is a generalization of the usual product in the sense that

$$J \&^I K = J \& K$$

where I is the empty-game. Moreover, $J \&^C K$ and $J \& K$ are essentially the same structures, in which the difference is just whether to take two copies of C-moves. Thus, we often call a tailed product $J \&^C K$ just a product, and write $J \& K$ for it.

Of course, we have:

Proposition 2.4.19 (Well-defined tailed product)**.** For any (resp. fully) dynamic games J, K with $\mathcal{H}^\omega(J) = C \multimap A$, $\mathcal{H}^\omega(K) = C \multimap B$, the tailed product $J \&^C K$ forms a well-defined (resp. fully) dynamic game.

Proof. Analogous to the case of the product. □

2.4.4 Exponential

The construction of the *exponential* will be crucial when we equip the category of games and strategies with a cartesian closed structure.

Definition 2.4.20 (Exponential [HO00, McC98])**.** For any game A, we define its **exponential** $!A$ as follows:

- $M_{!A} \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} M_A$
- $\lambda_{!A} \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \lambda_A$

- $\vdash_{!A} \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \vdash_A$
- $P_{!A}$

  $\stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \{s \in L_{!A} \mid s \upharpoonright m \in P_A \text{ for each occurrence } m \text{ of an initial move in } M_{!A}\}$
  $= \{s \in L_A \mid s \upharpoonright m \in P_A \text{ for each occurrence } m \text{ of an initial move in } M_A\}$

To establish that the construction of exponential preserves the (fully) dynamic structure of games, we need the following lemma:

Lemma 2.4.21 (Internal switching lemma for exponential)**.** Let A be a game, and assume $smnt \in P_{!A}$. If m, n are internal P- and O- moves, respectively, then they belong to the same thread.

Proof. By the same argument as the proof of Lemma 2.4.4, but for infinitely many component games (copies of A), rather than for two components. □

Now, we can prove:

Proposition 2.4.22 (Well-defined exponential)**.** For any (resp. fully) dynamic game A, the structure $!A$ forms a well-defined (resp. fully) dynamic game.

Proof. We first assume that A is fully dynamic. Again, it suffices to show the preservation property of the additional conditions in (E1), (E2), (E4) and generalized (V3). However, the arena part of $!A$ is the same as that of A; so it remains to show generalized (V3) for $!A$.

Let d be a natural number, and assume $smn, s'm'n' \in P_{!A}$, where n, n' are j-internal O-moves with $j > d$ and $\mathcal{H}^d_{!A}(sm) = \mathcal{H}^d_{!A}(s'm')$. Note that m, m' both must be j-internal P-moves by the EI-switch condition; so we have $m = m'$. Hence, by Lemma 2.4.21, m, m', n, n' all belong to the same thread; let a be the initial occurrence that starts the thread. Then $(s \upharpoonright a).mn, (s' \upharpoonright a).m'n' \in P_A$, and

$$\mathcal{H}^d_A((s \upharpoonright a).m) = \mathcal{H}^d_{!A}(sm) \upharpoonright a = \mathcal{H}^d_{!A}(s'm') \upharpoonright a = \mathcal{H}^d_A((s' \upharpoonright a).m')$$

Hence by generalized (V3) for A, we have $n = n'$, and

$$\mathcal{J}^{\ominus d}_{smn}(n) = \mathcal{J}^{\ominus d}_{(s \upharpoonright a).mn}(n) = \mathcal{J}^{\ominus d}_{(s' \upharpoonright a).m'n'}(n') = \mathcal{J}^{\ominus d}_{s'm'n'}(n')$$

We have established generalized (V3) for $!A$; hence, $!A$ is fully dynamic. Finally, assuming that A is dynamic but not necessarily fully dynamic, we may show that $!A$ is again dynamic in a completely analogous way. □

Note that if a game J satisfies $\mathcal{H}^\omega(J) = !A \multimap B$, then its exponential $!J$ has $\mathcal{H}^\omega(!J) = !A \multimap !B$.

Finally, we establish a proposition, which will be used later:

Proposition 2.4.23 (Even-length interleaved exponential)**.** Let G be a game, and $t = s_1 \dots s_{n+1} \in P_{!G}$, where each s_i is single-threaded, and $\text{init}\{s_i\} \neq \text{init}\{s_{i+1}\}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$, where $\text{init}\{s_i\}$ denotes the initial occurrence that starts the thread to which s_i belongs. Then we have $\text{even}\{s_i\}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$.

Proof. By induction on the number n.

- **IB.** Consider $n = 0$. Then the claim vacuously holds.
- **IS.** Assume $t = s_1 \dots s_{n+1}s_{n+2} \in P_{!G}$, where each s_i is single-threaded, and $\mathrm{init}\{s_i\} \neq \mathrm{init}\{s_{i+1}\}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n+1$. Note that $s_1 \dots s_{n+1} \in P_{!G}$; thus by the induction hypothesis, we have $\mathrm{even}\{s_i\}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. We have to show $\mathrm{even}\{s_{n+1}\}$.

  Let q, q' be the initial moves that initiate the threads to which s_{n+1}, s_{n+2} belong, respectively. We must have $q \neq q'$, and $t \upharpoonright q, t \upharpoonright q' \in P_G$; so by the induction hypothesis and the alternation condition for G, s_{n+1} and s_{n+2} both begin with an O-move. Hence by the alternation condition for $!G$, we conclude that $\mathrm{even}\{s_{n+1}\}$.

□

2.4.5 Explicit Linear Implication

In this section, we introduce a new construction in the universe of games, called *explicit linear implication*, which plays a crucial role in formulating the game-semantic computational process.

Roughly speaking, if we have strategies $\sigma : A \multimap B$, $\tau : B \multimap C$, then their *"non-hiding" composition* $\sigma \ddagger \tau$, which will be introduced later, forms a strategy on the explicit linear implication $A \overset{B}{\multimap} C$.

Definition 2.4.24 (Explicit linear implication)**.** Given explicit games A, B, and a game C, we define the game

$$A \overset{B}{\multimap} C = (M, \lambda, \vdash, P)$$

called the **explicit linear implication** from A to C through B, where the components (the subscript $A \overset{B}{\multimap} C$ is omitted here) are defined as follows: If $B \neq I$, then

- $M \overset{\text{df.}}{=} M_A + M_{B_1} + M_{B_2} + M_C$
- $\lambda \overset{\text{df.}}{=} [\overline{\lambda_A}, \lambda_{B_1}^{+k}, \overline{\lambda_{B_2}^{+k}}, \lambda_C]$
  where $k \overset{\text{df.}}{=} \sup(\{\lambda_A^{\mathbb{N}}(m) + 1 \mid m \in M_A\} \cup \{\lambda_C^{\mathbb{N}}(m') + 1 \mid m' \in M_C\})$
- $\star \vdash m \overset{\text{df.}}{\Leftrightarrow} m$ is an initial C-move
- $m \vdash n \wedge m \neq \star$

  $\overset{\text{df.}}{\Leftrightarrow}$ (m, n are initial moves of C, B_2, respectively) $\vee$
  (m, n are initial moves of B_2, B_1, respectively) $\vee$
  (m, n are initial moves of B_1, A, respectively) $\vee$
  $(m \vdash_A n) \vee (m \vdash_B n) \vee (m \vdash_C n)$

- $P \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \{s \in M^* \mid s \restriction A, B_1 \in P_{A \multimap B_1}, s \restriction B_2, C \in P_{B_2 \multimap C}, s \restriction B_1, B_2 \in \mathrm{pr}_B\}$ where we define

$$\mathrm{pr}_G \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \{s \in P_{G_1 \multimap G_2} \mid \forall t \preceq s.\ \mathrm{even}(t) \to t \restriction G_1 = t \restriction G_2\}$$

  for all games G (the subscripts in B and G are to distinguish the two copies of the games, respectively). The P-moves in pr_G, which are not initial in G_1, "copy and paste" the pointers of the last moves as well. Then the pointers of the valid positions in P are taken over the ones in $P_{A \multimap B_1}$, pr_B and $P_{B_2 \multimap C}$.

If $B = I$, then we just define $A \overset{B}{\multimap} C \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} C$.

We have to show that this construction is well-defined. However, it is actually a particular instance of another construction called *external interaction*, which will be introduced in the next section. Hence, all the facts about explicit linear implication will be established there.

2.4.6 External interaction

We now further define a new construction on games, called *external interaction*.

Definition 2.4.25 (External interaction)**.** Given games J, K such that

$$\mathcal{H}^\omega(J) = A \multimap B$$
$$\mathcal{H}^\omega(K) = B \multimap C$$

where A, B, C are explicit games, we define their **external interaction** $J \triangleright K$ as follows: If $B = I$, then we just define $J \triangleright K \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} K$; otherwise,

- $M_{J \triangleright K} \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} M_J + M_K$
- $\lambda_{J \triangleright K} \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} [\lambda_J^{B_1^{+k}}, \lambda_K^{B_2^{+k}}]$
  where $k \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \sup(\{\lambda_J^{\mathbb{N}}(m) + 1 \mid m \in M_J\} \cup \{\lambda_K^{\mathbb{N}}(m') + 1 \mid m' \in M_K\})$
- $\star \vdash_{J \triangleright K} n \stackrel{\text{df.}}{\Leftrightarrow} \star \vdash_K n\ (\Leftrightarrow \star \vdash_C n)$
- $m \vdash_{J \triangleright K} n\ (m \neq \star) \stackrel{\text{df.}}{\Leftrightarrow} m \vdash_J n \vee m \vdash_K n \vee (\star \vdash_{B_2} m \wedge \star \vdash_{B_1} n)$
- $P_{J \triangleright K} \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \{s \in M^*_{J \triangleright K} \mid s \restriction J \in P_J, s \restriction K \in P_K, s \restriction B_1, B_2 \in \mathrm{pr}_B\}$

where we distinguish the two occurrences of B by the subscripts $1, 2$, and $\lambda_G^{H^{+k}}$ is almost the same as λ_G except that the output of $\lambda_G^{\mathbb{N}}$ is increased by k for H-moves.

As stated previously, explicit linear implication is a particular type of external interaction:

Proposition 2.4.26 (ELI as EI)**.** Given explicit games A, B and a game C, we have

$$(A \multimap B) \triangleright (B \multimap C) = A \overset{B}{\multimap} C$$

Proof. Immediate from the definition. □

Now, we show the following:

Proposition 2.4.27 (Well-defined external interaction)**.** For any dynamic games J, K with $\mathcal{H}^\omega(J) = A \multimap B$ and $\mathcal{H}^\omega(K) = B \multimap C$ for some explicit games A, B, C, their external interaction $J \triangleright K$ is a well-defined dynamic game.

Proof. Since the case $B = I$ is trivial, we assume $B \neq I$. We first show the arena part $J \triangleright K$ is well-defined. The set of moves and the labeling function are clearly well-defined. For the enabling relation, observe that:

- **(E1)** It is clearly satisfied because the initial moves are those in C and $\lambda_{J \triangleright K}$ acts as λ_C on those moves.
- **(E2)** Assume that $m \vdash_{J \triangleright K} n$ with $\lambda^{\mathrm{QA}}_{J \triangleright K}(n) = \mathrm{A}$.
  - If $m \vdash_J n$, then it suffices to show that it is impossible to have

    $$(m \in M_{B_1} \cup M^{\mathrm{I}}_J \wedge n \notin M_{B_1} \cup M^{\mathrm{I}}_J) \vee (m \notin M_{B_1} \cup M^{\mathrm{I}}_J \wedge n \in M_{B_1} \cup M^{\mathrm{I}}_J)$$

    If $m \in M_{B_1} \cup M^{\mathrm{I}}_J \wedge n \notin M_{B_1} \cup M^{\mathrm{I}}_J$, then $n \in M_A$; but it implies m is external, and then $\star \vdash_{B_1} m \wedge \star \vdash_A n$; so in particular $\lambda^{\mathrm{QA}}_{J \triangleright K}(n) = \mathrm{Q}$, a contradiction. Also, if $m \notin M_{B_1} \cup M^{\mathrm{I}}_J \wedge n \in M_{B_1} \cup M^{\mathrm{I}}_J$, then $m \in M_A$ and n is internal; however, it contradicts the requirement $\lambda^{\mathbb{N}}_J(m) = \lambda^{\mathbb{N}}_J(n)$.
  - The case $m \vdash_K n$ can be handled in a similar way to the above case.
  - If $\star \vdash_{B_2} m$ and $\star \vdash_{B_1} n$, then $\lambda^{\mathrm{QA}}_{J \triangleright K}(n) = \mathrm{Q}$, a contradiction; so this case cannot happen.
- **(E3)** Suppose $m \vdash_{J \triangleright K} n$. The cases $m \vdash_J n$ and $m \vdash_K n$ are trivial. For the case $\star \vdash_{B_2} m \wedge \star \vdash_{B_1} n$, we have $\lambda^{\mathrm{OP}}_{J \triangleright K}(m) = \mathrm{P} \neq \mathrm{O} = \lambda^{\mathrm{OP}}_{J \triangleright K}(n)$.
- **(E4)** Let $m \vdash_{J \triangleright K} n$ and $\lambda^{\mathbb{N}}_{J \triangleright K}(m) \neq \lambda^{\mathbb{N}}_{J \triangleright K}(n)$. We proceed by a case analysis:
  - Assume $m \vdash_J n$. If $\lambda^{\mathbb{N}}_J(m) \neq \lambda^{\mathbb{N}}_J(n)$, then it is trivial; so assume it is not the case. Then m, n must be both external in J, in particular $\star \vdash_{B_1} m$ and $\star \vdash_A n$, which clearly satisfies the requirement.
  - The case $m \vdash_K n$ can be handled in the same way.
  - If $\star \vdash_{B_2} m \wedge \star \vdash_{B_1} n$, then $\lambda^{\mathbb{N}}_{J \triangleright K}(m) = 1 = \lambda^{\mathbb{N}}_{J \triangleright K}(n)$, a contradiction; so this case cannot occur.

Next, we show that $P_{J \triangleright K} \subseteq L_{J \triangleright K}$. Let $s \in P_{J \triangleright K}$; we have to verify that s satisfies all the conditions for $s \in L_{J \triangleright K}$.



Table 2: The external interaction double parity diagram

Justification. The case $s = \epsilon$ is trivial; we assume $s \neq \epsilon$. Consider any prefix $tm \preceq s$. We proceed by a case analysis on m:

- If $m \in M_J$ and m is not initial in B_1, then $(t \upharpoonright J).m \in P_J$. Thus, m is justified by some J-move n in $t \upharpoonright J$, where $n \vdash_J m$. Thus, for tm, m is justified by n in t with $n \vdash_{J \triangleright K} m$.
- If m is initial in B_1, then since $(t \upharpoonright B_1, B_2).m \in \mathrm{pr}_B$, m is justified by an initial B_2-move b in $t \upharpoonright B_1, B_2$ (in this case, m is an initial B_1-move). Thus, m is justified by a move b in t with $b \vdash_{J \triangleright K} m$.
- If $m \in M_K$, then $(t \upharpoonright K).m \in P_K$. Thus, m is justified some K-move n in $t \upharpoonright K$, where $n \vdash_K m$. Thus, for tm, m is justified by n in t with $n \vdash_{J \triangleright K} m$.

Hence, s satisfies the justification condition.

Alternation. It is straightforward to see that s satisfies the alternation condition by the parity diagram, which is depicted in Table 2, in which a state $(J_1^{J_2}, K_1^{K_2})$ represents that the next possible J- (resp. K-) move has the OP-parity J_1 (resp. K_1) and the EI-parity J_2 (resp. K_2). For readability, we write the states $\langle \mathrm{P}^I, \mathrm{O}^E \rangle$ and $[\mathrm{O}^E, \mathrm{P}^I]$ twice, with modified brackets $\langle \_, \_ \rangle$ and $[\_, \_]$, respectively.

Bracketing condition. Let $s = s_1 m s_2 n s_3$, where (m, n) is a QA-pair. We have to show that there is no pending question in s_2. Note that m, n are either both J-moves or K-moves. Also,

$$m \text{ is a } B_1\text{-move} \Leftrightarrow n \text{ is a } B_1\text{-move}$$
$$m \text{ is a } B_2\text{-move} \Leftrightarrow n \text{ is a } B_2\text{-move}$$

We now proceed by a case analysis.

- Assume $m, n \in M_K \setminus M_{B_2}$. Then, there is no pending question of K in s_2 because of the QA-pair (m, n). Also, there is no pending question of B_1 in s_2 either, since otherwise there would be the corresponding "copied" pending question of B_2 in s_2. Now, suppose, for a contradiction, that there is a pending question $q \in M_J \setminus M_{B_1}$. By Table 2, we may write

$$s_2 = t_1.u_1.v_1.q.v_2.u_2.t_2$$

where $t_1, t_2 \in (M_K \setminus M_{B_2})^*$, $u_1, u_2 \in M_B^*$, $v_1, v_2 \in M_{J \triangleright K}^*$. Note that every question in $(v_2 \upharpoonright B).u_2$ must have its answer in $(v_2 \upharpoonright B).u_2$ by the bracketing condition for K and the presence of the QA-pair (m, n). Also, every answer in $(v_2 \upharpoonright B).u_2$ must have its question in $(v_2 \upharpoonright B).u_2$ by the bracketing condition for J and the presence of q. Then by Lemma 2.1.31, $(v_2 \upharpoonright B).u_2$ is QA-isomorphic; so in particular, the lengths of $v_2.u_2 \upharpoonright B_1$ and $v_2.u_2 \upharpoonright B_2$ are both even. However, Table 2 implies that they must be odd, a contradiction. Hence, there is no pending question of J in s_2 either.

- Assume $m, n \in M_{B_2}$. We have $s = s_1 m m' s_2' n' n s_3$ or $s = s_1' m' m s_2 n n' s_3'$, where $m', n' \in M_{B_1}$ are copies of m, n, respectively. Then by the bracketing condition for J and K, there cannot be a pending question in s_2.

- Assume $m, n \in M_{B_1}$. It can be handled in the same way as the case $m, n \in M_{B_2}$.

- Assume $m, n \in M_J \setminus M_{B_1}$. It can be handled in a similar way to the case $m, n \in M_K \setminus M_{B_2}$.

Visibility. Consider arbitrary prefix $tm \preceq s$, where m is non-initial. We may write

$$tm = t_1.n.t_2.m$$

where m is justified by n. We now need the following lemma:

Lemma 2.4.28 (View lemma EI)**.** Let J, K be games such that $\mathcal{H}^\omega(J) = A \multimap B$ and $\mathcal{H}^\omega(K) = B \multimap C$. Then for any valid position $t \in P_{J \triangleright K}$, we have:

1. If the last move of t is in $M_J \setminus M_{B_1}$, then

$$\lceil t \upharpoonright J \rceil_J \preceq \lceil t \rceil_{J \triangleright K} \upharpoonright J$$
$$\lfloor t \upharpoonright J \rfloor_J \preceq \lfloor t \rfloor_{J \triangleright K} \upharpoonright J$$

2. If the last move of t is in $M_K \setminus M_{B_2}$, then

$$\lceil t \upharpoonright K \rceil_K \preceq \lceil t \rceil_{J \triangleright K} \upharpoonright K$$
$$\lfloor t \upharpoonright K \rfloor_K \preceq \lfloor t \rfloor_{J \triangleright K} \upharpoonright K$$

3. If the last move of t is an O-move in $M_{B_1} \cup M_{B_2}$, then

$$\lceil t \upharpoonright B_1, B_2 \rceil_{B_1 \multimap B_2} \preceq \lfloor t \rfloor_{J \triangleright K} \upharpoonright B_1, B_2$$
$$\lfloor t \upharpoonright B_1, B_2 \rfloor_{B_1 \multimap B_2} \preceq \lceil t \rceil_{J \triangleright K} \upharpoonright B_1, B_2$$

Proof of the lemma. See Appendix A.2.1.
We then proceed by a case analysis on m.

- Assume $m \in M_J \setminus M_{B_1}$. Then n must be a J-move. If $t_2 = \epsilon$, then it is trivial; so we assume $t_2 = t_2' x$. It is immediate to see, by Table 2, that x is a J-move. By Lemma 2.4.28,

$$\lceil t \upharpoonright J \rceil \preceq \lceil t \rceil \upharpoonright J$$
$$\lfloor t \upharpoonright J \rfloor \preceq \lfloor t \rfloor \upharpoonright J$$

  Also, since $(t \upharpoonright J).m \in P_J$, we have

$$n \text{ occurs in } \lceil t \upharpoonright J \rceil \text{ if } m \text{ is a P-move}$$
$$n \text{ occurs in } \lfloor t \upharpoonright J \rfloor \text{ if } m \text{ is an O-move}$$

  Hence we may conclude that n occurs in $\lceil t \rceil$ (resp. $\lfloor t \rfloor$) if m is a P-move (resp. an O-move).

- Assume $m \in M_K \setminus M_{B_2}$. Then n must be a K-move. If $t_2 = \epsilon$, then it is trivial; so we assume $t_2 = t_2' x$, where x is a K-move by a similar argument. By Lemma 2.4.28,

$$\lceil t \upharpoonright K \rceil \preceq \lceil t \rceil \upharpoonright K$$
$$\lfloor t \upharpoonright K \rfloor \preceq \lfloor t \rfloor \upharpoonright K$$

  Also, since $(t \upharpoonright K).m \in P_K$, we have

$$n \text{ occurs in } \lceil t \upharpoonright K \rceil \text{ if } m \text{ is a P-move}$$
$$n \text{ occurs in } \lfloor t \upharpoonright K \rfloor \text{ if } m \text{ is an O-move}$$

  Hence we may conclude that n occurs in $\lceil t \rceil$ (resp. $\lfloor t \rfloor$) if m is a P-move (resp. an O-move).

- Assume $m \in M_{B_1}$. If m is a P-move, then $n \in M_J$ and the previous move to m is a J-move; so it can be handled in the same way as the case $m \in M_J \setminus M_{B_1}$. Thus assume that m is an O-move. Again, let $t_2 = t_2' x$, where x is a B_2-move which is the "copy" of m. Then, since x is an O-move in the game $B_1 \multimap B_2$, by Lemma 2.4.28,

$$\lceil t \upharpoonright B_1, B_2 \rceil \preceq \lfloor t \rfloor \upharpoonright B_1, B_2$$

  Note that n must be a B_1-move or an initial B_2-move. In either case, we have $(t \upharpoonright B_1, B_2).m \in P_{B_1 \multimap B_2}$, so n occurs in $\lceil t \upharpoonright B_1, B_2 \rceil$. Hence we conclude that n occurs in $\lfloor t \rfloor$.

- Assume $m \in M_{B_2}$. If m is a P-move, then n and the previous move to m are both K-moves; so it can be dealt with in the same way as the case $m \in M_K \setminus M_{B_2}$. Now, assume m is an O-move, and $t_2 = t_2' x$, where by Table 2, $x \in M_{B_1}$ is the "copy" of m. Thus by Lemma 2.4.28,

$$\lceil t \restriction B_1, B_2 \rceil \preceq \lfloor t \rfloor \restriction B_1, B_2$$

And again, we have $(t \restriction B_1, B_2).m \in P_{B_1 \multimap B_2}$, so n occurs in $\lceil t \restriction B_1, B_2 \rceil$. Hence we conclude that n occurs in $\lfloor t \rfloor$.

External visibility. As we shall see shortly, the external visibility for $J \triangleright K$ is reduced to the visibility for the linear implication $A \multimap C$.

EI-switch. Assume that $s = s_1.m.n.s_2$, where $\lambda^{\mathbb{N}}_{J \triangleright K}(m) \neq \lambda^{\mathbb{N}}_{J \triangleright K}(n)$; we have to show that m is an O-move. However, it is immediate from Table 2.

Therefore we have shown $s \in L_{J \triangleright K}$. Finally, we verify the axioms (V1), (V2) and (V3).

- **(V1)** Clearly, $P_{J \triangleright K}$ contains ϵ; so it is non-empty. For the prefix-closure, let $sm \in P_{J \triangleright K}$. If $m \in M_J$, then $(s \restriction J).m \in P_J$, whence $s \restriction J \in P_J$. Also, it is easy to see $s \restriction K \in P_K$ and $s \restriction B_1, B_2 \in \mathrm{pr}_B$. Thus we have $s \in P_{J \triangleright K}$. The case $m \in M_K$ is analogous.

- **(V2)** Assume $s \in P_{J \triangleright K}$ and let I be a set of initial occurrences in s. We define

$$I_J \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \{b \in M_{B_1} \mid \star \vdash_{B_1} b \wedge b \text{ occurs in } s \restriction I\}$$
$$I_B \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \{b \in M_{B_2} \mid \star \vdash_{B_2} b \wedge b \text{ occurs in } s \restriction I\}$$
$$I_K \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} I$$

Note that I_J, I_B, I_K are sets of initial occurrences in s with respect to the games $J, B_1 \multimap B_2, K$, respectively. Observe that

$$(s \restriction I) \restriction J = (s \restriction J) \restriction I_J \in P_J$$
$$(s \restriction I) \restriction B_1, B_2 = (s \restriction B_1, B_2) \restriction I_B \in \mathrm{pr}_B$$
$$(s \restriction I) \restriction K = (s \restriction K) \restriction I_K \in P_K$$

Thus, we may conclude $s \restriction I \in P_{J \triangleright K}$.

- **(V3)** Assume $smn, smn' \in P_{J \triangleright K}$, where n, n' are internal O-moves. See Table 3, where the symbol

$$(A^{\mathrm{E}}_{\mathrm{OP}} \overset{J^{\mathrm{I}}_{\mathrm{OP}}}{\multimap} (B_1)^{\mathrm{E}}_{\mathrm{OP}}, (B_2)^{\mathrm{E}}_{\mathrm{OP}} \overset{K^{\mathrm{I}}_{\mathrm{OP}}}{\multimap} C^{\mathrm{E}}_{\mathrm{OP}})$$

represents the state in which the next possible move in M_A, $M_J \setminus M_{\mathcal{H}^\omega(J)}$, M_{B_1}, M_{B_2}, $M_K \setminus M_{\mathcal{H}^\omega(K)}$, M_C has the OP-parity $A^{\mathrm{E}}_{\mathrm{OP}}$, $J^{\mathrm{I}}_{\mathrm{OP}}$, $(B_1)^{\mathrm{E}}_{\mathrm{OP}}$, $(B_2)^{\mathrm{E}}_{\mathrm{OP}}$, $K^{\mathrm{I}}_{\mathrm{OP}}$, $C^{\mathrm{E}}_{\mathrm{OP}}$, respectively. Then it is straightforward to see that we have either $m, n, n' \in M_J \setminus M_{\mathcal{H}^\omega(J)}$ or $m, n, n' \in M_K \setminus M_{\mathcal{H}^\omega(K)}$. Hence by (V3) for J or K, we conclude $n = n'$ and $\mathcal{J}_{smn}(n) = \mathcal{J}_{smn'}(n')$.

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
 & (\mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{E}} \overset{\mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{I}}}{\multimap} \mathrm{O}^{\mathrm{E}}, \mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{E}} \overset{\mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{I}}}{\multimap} \mathrm{O}^{\mathrm{E}}) & \\
 & C \downarrow \uparrow C & \\
 & (\mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{E}} \overset{\mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{I}}}{\multimap} \mathrm{O}^{\mathrm{E}}, \mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{E}} \overset{\mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{I}}}{\multimap} \mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{E}}) \overset{K^{\mathrm{I}}}{\longleftrightarrow} (\mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{E}} \overset{\mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{I}}}{\multimap} \mathrm{O}^{\mathrm{E}}, \mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{E}} \overset{\mathrm{O}^{\mathrm{I}}}{\multimap} \mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{E}}) \\
 & B_2 \vdots \downarrow \uparrow \vdots B_2 & \\
 & B_1 \qquad\quad B_1 & \\
(\mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{E}} \overset{\mathrm{O}^{\mathrm{I}}}{\multimap} \mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{E}}, \mathrm{O}^{\mathrm{E}} \overset{\mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{I}}}{\multimap} \mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{E}}) & \overset{J^{\mathrm{I}}}{\longleftrightarrow} & (\mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{E}} \overset{\mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{I}}}{\multimap} \mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{E}}, \mathrm{O}^{\mathrm{E}} \overset{\mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{I}}}{\multimap} \mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{E}}) \\
 & A \downarrow \uparrow A & \\
 & (O^{\mathrm{E}} \overset{\mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{I}}}{\multimap} \mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{E}}, \mathrm{O}^{\mathrm{E}} \overset{\mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{I}}}{\multimap} \mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{E}}) &
\end{array}
$$

Table 3: The external interaction parity diagram

□

To establish the closure of *full* dynamism under external interaction, we need the notion of *subgames*, so we postpone it later.

2.4.7 Notation

We have introduced various constructions on games with several arities. It is often useful to have a notation for any of these constructions. For this purpose, we write I for a finite "index set" and use the symbol ♣ for an arbitrary construction. Then, the result of applying a construction ♣ for games $G_i, i \in I$, is denoted by

$$\clubsuit_{i \in I} G_i$$

2.5 Subgames

In this section, we introduce the notion of *subgames*, which is a sort of "structure-preserving" subset relation, similar to subgroups, subcategories, etc., and establish some propositions about the subgame relation.

We first define the preliminary notion of *subarenas*:

Definition 2.5.1 (Subarenas)**.** A **subarena** of an arena G is an arena H that satisfies the following conditions:

- $M_H \subseteq M_G$
- $\lambda_H = \lambda_G \restriction M_H$
- $\vdash_H \subseteq \vdash_G \cap \{(\{\star\} + M_H) \times M_H\}$
- $\sup(\{\lambda_H^{\mathbb{N}}(m) \mid m \in M_H\}) = \sup(\{\lambda_G^{\mathbb{N}}(m) \mid m \in M_G\})$

In this case, we write $H \leqslant G$. Also, we often write $\sup(\lambda_H^{\mathbb{N}}) = \sup(\lambda_G^{\mathbb{N}})$ for the last condition.

We have an immediate fact, which is necessary to define the notion of subgames:

Lemma 2.5.2 (Sub legal positions)**.** Let H, G be arenas such that $H \leqslant G$. Then we have

$$L_H \subseteq L_G$$

Proof. Immediate by the definition. □

Now we define:

Definition 2.5.3 (Subgames)**.** A **subgame** of a game G is a game H that satisfies the following conditions:

- The arena part of H is a subarena of the arena part of G
- $P_H \subseteq P_G$

In this case, we also write $H \leqslant G$.

Note that, by the definition, a subgame of a fully dynamic game is also fully dynamic. We have an immediate characterization:

Lemma 2.5.4 (Subgame lemma)**.** Let G be a dynamic game. A structure $H = (M_H, \lambda_H, \vdash_H, P_H)$ is a subgame of G if and only if the following conditions are satisfied:

- $M_H \subseteq M_G$, $\lambda_H = \lambda_G \upharpoonright M_H$, $\vdash_H \subseteq \vdash_G \cap \{(\{\star\} + M_H) \times M_H\}$ and $P_H \subseteq P_G$.
- $\sup(\lambda_H^{\mathbb{N}}) = \sup(\lambda_G^{\mathbb{N}})$.
- P_H satisfies (V1) and (V2).

Proof. Immediate from the definition. □

Next, we shall show that the subgame relation is preserved under the hiding operation:

Proposition 2.5.5 (Hiding subgames)**.** Assume that G, G' are dynamic games with $G \leqslant G'$. Then,

1. $\mathcal{H}^\omega(G) \leqslant \mathcal{H}^\omega(G')$;
2. $\mathcal{H}(G) \leqslant \mathcal{H}(G')$ if G, G' are both fully dynamic.

Proof. We show only the clause 2; it is analogous to establish the clause 1. Assume that G, G' are fully dynamic.

First, we show $M_{\mathcal{H}(G)} \subseteq M_{\mathcal{H}(G')}$:

$$\begin{aligned} M_{\mathcal{H}(G)} &= \{m \in M_G \mid \lambda_G(m) \neq 1\} \\ &\subseteq \{m \in M_{G'} \mid \lambda_{G'}(m) \neq 1\} \\ &= M_{\mathcal{H}(G')} \end{aligned}$$

Also, $\lambda_{\mathcal{H}(G')} \restriction M_{\mathcal{H}(G)} = \lambda_{\mathcal{H}(G)}$ is immediate:

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{\mathcal{H}(G')} \restriction M_{\mathcal{H}(G)} &= (\lambda_{G'}^{\ominus 1} \restriction M_{\mathcal{H}(G')}) \restriction M_{\mathcal{H}(G)} \\ &= (\lambda_{G'}^{\ominus 1} \restriction M_{G'}) \restriction M_{\mathcal{H}(G)} \\ &= \lambda_{G'}^{\ominus 1} \restriction M_{\mathcal{H}(G)} \\ &= \lambda_{G}^{\ominus 1} \restriction M_{\mathcal{H}(G)} \\ &= \lambda_{\mathcal{H}(G)} \restriction M_{\mathcal{H}(G)} \\ &= \lambda_{\mathcal{H}(G)} \end{aligned}$$

Next, for the enabling relations, given any $m, n \in M_{\mathcal{H}(G)}$ with $m \neq \star$,

$$\begin{aligned} \star \vdash_{\mathcal{H}(G)} n &\Leftrightarrow \star \vdash_G n \\ &\Rightarrow \star \vdash_{G'} n \\ &\Leftrightarrow \star \vdash_{\mathcal{H}(G')} n \end{aligned}$$

as well as

$$\begin{aligned} m \vdash_{\mathcal{H}(G)} n \Leftrightarrow\ & (\exists k \in \mathbb{N}.\, \exists x_1, \ldots, x_{2k} \in M_G^1.\, m \vdash_G x_1, x_1 \vdash_G x_2, \\ & \ldots, x_{2k-1} \vdash_G x_{2k}, x_{2k} \vdash_G n) \\ \Rightarrow\ & (\exists k \in \mathbb{N}.\, \exists x_1, \ldots, x_{2k} \in M_{G'}^1.\, m \vdash_{G'} x_1, x_1 \vdash_{G'} x_2, \\ & \ldots, x_{2k-1} \vdash_{G'} x_{2k}, x_{2k} \vdash_{G'} n) \\ \Leftrightarrow\ & m \vdash_{\mathcal{H}(G')} n \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we show $P_{\mathcal{H}(G)} \subseteq P_{\mathcal{H}(G')}$:

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\mathcal{H}(G)} &= \{\mathcal{H}(s) \mid s \in P_G\} \\ &\subseteq \{\mathcal{H}(s) \mid s \in P_{G'}\} \\ &= P_{\mathcal{H}(G')} \end{aligned}$$

□

Now, we show that the subgame relation is preserved under all the constructions on games:

Proposition 2.5.6 (Preservation of subgame relation)**.** Let $\clubsuit$ be a construction on games with arity k, and G_i games for $i = 1, \ldots, k$. Then for any subgames $H_i \leqslant G_i$, $i = 1, \ldots, k$, we have

$$\clubsuit_{i=1}^k H_i \leqslant \clubsuit_{i=1}^k G_i$$

Proof. Let G_i, H_i be games such that $H_i \leqslant G_i$ for $i = 1, 2$. We have to verify the claim for all the constructions.

Tensor product. We shall show $H_1 \otimes H_2 \leqslant G_1 \otimes G_2$. Observe the following:

- $M_{H_1 \otimes H_2} = M_{H_1} + M_{H_2} \subseteq M_{G_1} + M_{G_2} = M_{G_1 \otimes G_2}$
- For the labeling function, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda_{H_1 \otimes H_2} &= [\lambda_{H_1}, \lambda_{H_2}] \\
&= [\lambda_{G_1} \restriction M_{H_1}, \lambda_{G_2} \restriction M_{H_2}] \\
&= [\lambda_{G_1} \restriction M_{H_1 \otimes H_2}, \lambda_{G_2} \restriction M_{H_1 \otimes H_2}] \\
&= [\lambda_{G_1}, \lambda_{G_2}] \restriction M_{H_1 \otimes H_2} \\
&= \lambda_{G_1 \otimes G_2} \restriction M_{H_1 \otimes H_2}
\end{aligned}$$

For the enabling relations, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\vdash_{H_1 \otimes H_2} &= \vdash_{H_1} \cup \vdash_{H_2} \\
&\subseteq [\vdash_{G_1} \cap \{(\star + M_{H_1}) \times M_{H_1}\}] \cup [\vdash_{G_2} \cap \{(\star + M_{H_2}) \times M_{H_2}\}] \\
&= [\vdash_{G_1} \cap \{(\star + M_{H_1 \otimes H_2}) \times M_{H_1 \otimes H_2}\}] \\
&\quad \cup [\vdash_{G_2} \cap \{(\star + M_{H_1 \otimes H_2}) \times M_{H_1 \otimes H_2}\}] \\
&= (\vdash_{G_1} \cup \vdash_{G_2}) \cap \{(\star + M_{H_1 \otimes H_2}) \times M_{H_1 \otimes H_2}\} \\
&= \vdash_{G_1 \otimes G_2} \cap \{(\star + M_{H_1 \otimes H_2}) \times M_{H_1 \otimes H_2}\}
\end{aligned}$$

For the valid positions, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
P_{H_1 \otimes H_2} &= \{s \in L_{H_1 \otimes H_2} \mid s \restriction H_i \in P_{H_i}, i = 1, 2\} \\
&= \{s \in L_{H_1 \otimes H_2} \mid s \restriction G_i \in P_{H_i}, i = 1, 2\} \\
&\subseteq \{s \in L_{G_1 \otimes G_2} \mid s \restriction G_i \in P_{G_i}, i = 1, 2\} \text{ (by Lemma 2.5.2)} \\
&= P_{G_1 \otimes G_2}
\end{aligned}$$

Linear implication. We shall show $H_1 \multimap H_2 \leqslant G_1 \multimap G_2$.

- The set of moves and the labeling function can be handled in the same way as the tensor product.
- For the enabling relation, we have:
  - If $\star \vdash_{H_1 \multimap H_2} n$, then $\star \vdash_{H_2} n$. Thus, $\star \vdash_{G_2} n$, whence $\star \vdash_{G_1 \multimap G_2} n$.
  - If $m \vdash_{H_1 \multimap H_2} n \wedge m \neq \star$, then $m \vdash_{H_1} n$, $m \vdash_{H_2} n$ or $\star \vdash_{H_2} m \wedge \star \vdash_{H_1} n$, which implies $m, n \in M_{H_1} \wedge m \vdash_{G_1} n$, $m, n \in M_{H_2} \wedge m \vdash_{G_2} n$, or $m \in M_{H_2} \wedge n \in M_{H_1} \wedge \star \vdash_{G_2} m \wedge \star \vdash_{G_1} n$. Thus we have $m, n \in M_{H_1 \multimap H_2}$ and $m \vdash_{G_1} n \vee m \vdash_{G_2} n \vee (\star \vdash_{G_2} m \wedge \star \vdash_{G_1} n)$, which is equivalent to $m \vdash_{G_1 \multimap G_2} n$ with $m, n \in M_{H_1 \multimap H_2}$.
- $P_{H_1 \multimap H_2} \subseteq P_{G_1 \multimap G_2}$ can be shown in the same way as the tensor product.

Product. We shall show $H_1 \& H_2 \leqslant G_1 \& G_2$.

- The arena parts can be dealt with exactly in the same way as the tensor product.
- To show $P_{H_1 \& H_2} \subseteq P_{G_1 \& G_2}$, let $s \in P_{H_1 \& H_2}$. Then $s \in L_{G_1 \& G_2}$. If $s \restriction H_1 = P_{H_1}$ and $s \restriction H_2 = \epsilon$, then $s \restriction G_1 = P_{H_1} \subseteq P_{G_1}$ and $s \restriction G_2 = \epsilon$, i.e., $s \in P_{G_1 \& G_2}$. Also, if $s \restriction H_2 = P_{H_2}$ and $s \restriction H_1 = \epsilon$, then $s \restriction G_2 = P_{H_2} \subseteq P_{G_2}$ and $s \restriction G_1 = \epsilon$, i.e., $s \in P_{G_1 \& G_2}$.

Tailed product. Similar to the case of the (ordinary) product.

Exponential. We shall show $!H_1 \leqslant !G_1$. Note that for the arena parts, we have $!H_1 = H_1$ and $!G_1 = G_1$; thus it suffices to show that $P_{!H_1} \subseteq P_{!G_1}$. But it is immediate:

$$\begin{aligned} s \in P_{!H_1} &\Leftrightarrow s \in L_{!H_1} \wedge s \restriction m \in P_{H_1} \text{ for all initial moves } m \text{ in } s \\ &\Rightarrow s \in L_{!H_1} = L_{!G_1} \wedge s \restriction m \in P_{H_1} \subseteq P_{G_1} \text{ for all initial moves } m \text{ in } s \\ &\Rightarrow s \in P_{!G_1} \end{aligned}$$

External interaction. Let J, K, J', K' be games with $J \leqslant J'$, $K \leqslant K'$ and $\mathcal{H}^\omega(J) = A \multimap B$, $\mathcal{H}^\omega(K) = B \multimap C$, $\mathcal{H}^\omega(J') = A' \multimap B'$, $\mathcal{H}^\omega(K') = B' \multimap C'$, where A, B, C, A', B', C' are all external. We shall show $J \triangleright K \leqslant J' \triangleright K'$.

First, $A \multimap B \leqslant A' \multimap B'$ and $B \multimap C \leqslant B' \multimap C'$ by Proposition 2.5.5. Then, it is not hard to see that $A \leqslant A'$, $B \leqslant B'$ and $C \leqslant C'$.

It is then easy to see $M_{J \triangleright K} \subseteq M_{J' \triangleright K'}$, and $\lambda_{J' \triangleright K'} \restriction M_{J \triangleright K} = \lambda_{J \triangleright K}$ (note that $\sup(\lambda^{\mathbb{N}}_J) = \sup(\lambda^{\mathbb{N}}_{J'})$ and $\sup(\lambda^{\mathbb{N}}_K) = \sup(\lambda^{\mathbb{N}}_{K'})$, so the labeling functions on B- and B'-moves coincide). Also, for any $m, n \in M_{J \triangleright K}$ with $m \neq \star$,

$$\begin{aligned} \star \vdash_{J \triangleright K} n &\Leftrightarrow \star \vdash_C n \\ &\Rightarrow \star \vdash_{C'} n \\ &\Leftrightarrow \star \vdash_{J' \triangleright K'} n \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} m \vdash_{J \triangleright K} n &\Leftrightarrow m \vdash_J n \vee m \vdash_K n \vee (\star \vdash_{B_2} m \wedge \star \vdash_{B_1} n) \\ &\Rightarrow m \vdash_{J'} n \vee m \vdash_{K'} n \vee (\star \vdash_{B'_2} m \wedge \star \vdash_{B'_1} n) \\ &\Leftrightarrow m \vdash_{J' \triangleright K'} n \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we show $P_{J \triangleright K} \subseteq P_{J' \triangleright K'}$:

$$\begin{aligned} P_{J \triangleright K} &= \{ s \in M^*_{J \triangleright K} \mid s \restriction J \in P_J, s \restriction K \in P_K, s \restriction B_1, B_2 \in \mathrm{pr}_B \} \\ &\subseteq \{ s \in M^*_{J' \triangleright K'} \mid s \restriction J' \in P_{J'}, s \restriction K' \in P_{K'}, s \restriction B'_1, B'_2 \in \mathrm{pr}_{B'} \} \\ &= P_{J' \triangleright K'} \end{aligned}$$

□

2.6 Homomorphism Theorem for Hiding on Games

In this section, we shall prove that the hiding operation $\mathcal{H}$ on games gives rise to a homomorphism, i.e., it preserves the constructions on games. However, strictly speaking, it does not preserve one operation, namely external interaction.

2.6.1 Hiding Operation on External Interaction

We begin by observing the effect of hiding on external interaction. For this, we first need the following lemma:

Lemma 2.6.1 (External interaction lemma)**.** Let J, K be the dynamic games with the properties assumed in Definition 2.4.25. For any external moves $m, n \in M^0_{J \triangleright K}$, let us denote $m \diamondsuit n$ if we have

$$m \vdash_{J \triangleright K} x_1, x_1 \vdash_{J \triangleright K} x_2, \ldots, x_{2l-1} \vdash_{J \triangleright K} x_{2l}, x_{2l} \vdash_{J \triangleright K} n$$

for some $l \in \mathbb{N}^+$, internal moves $x_1, \ldots, x_{2l} \in M^{>0}_{J \triangleright K}$. Then, $m \diamondsuit n$ holds iff either:

1. We have $\star \vdash_C m \wedge \star \vdash_A n$, and $x_1 \in M_{B_2} \wedge x_2 \in M_{B_1}$, where x_1, x_2 are two copies of an initial move b in B. We write $m \diamondsuit_B n$ in this case.
2. For some $l \in \mathbb{N}^+$, $x_1, \ldots, x_{2l} \in M^{>0}_J$, we have

   $$m \vdash_J x_1, x_1 \vdash_J x_2, \ldots, x_{2l-1} \vdash_J x_{2l}, x_{2l} \vdash_J n$$

   We write $m \diamondsuit_J n$ in this case.
3. For some $l \in \mathbb{N}^+$, $x_1, \ldots, x_{2l} \in M^{>0}_K$, we have

   $$m \vdash_K x_1, x_1 \vdash_K x_2, \ldots, x_{2l-1} \vdash_K x_{2l}, x_{2l} \vdash_K n$$

   We write $m \diamondsuit_K n$ in this case.

Proof. Immediate from the definition. □

Now, we show:

Proposition 2.6.2 (Hiding external interaction 1)**.** Let J, K be dynamic games with $\mathcal{H}^\omega(J) = A \multimap B$, $\mathcal{H}^\omega(K) = B \multimap C$ for some explicit games A, B, C. Then,

$$\mathcal{H}^\omega(J \triangleright K) \leqslant A \multimap C$$

Proof. The case $B = I$ is trivial: $C \leqslant A \multimap C$; so we assume $B \neq I$. Let us define $G_1 \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \mathcal{H}^\omega(J \triangleright K)$ and $G_2 \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} A \multimap C$.

- $M_{G_1} = (M_{\mathcal{H}^\omega(J)} \backslash M_B) + (M_{\mathcal{H}^\omega(K)} \backslash M_B) = M_A + M_C = M_{G_2}$
- $\lambda_{G_1} = [\lambda_{\mathcal{H}^\omega(J)}, \lambda_{\mathcal{H}^\omega(K)}] \lfloor M_B = [\overline{\lambda_A}, \lambda_C] = \lambda_{G_2}$
- $\star \vdash_{G_1} n \Leftrightarrow \star \vdash_C n \Leftrightarrow \star \vdash_{G_2} n$

- For $m \neq \star$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& m \vdash_{G_1} n \\
\Leftrightarrow\ & m \vdash_{J \triangleright K} n \vee \{\exists k \in \mathbb{N}^+, x_1, \ldots, x_{2k} \in (M_{J \triangleright K} \setminus M_{G_1}). \\
& m \vdash_{J \triangleright K} x_1, x_1 \vdash_{J \triangleright K} x_2, \ldots, x_{2k-1} \vdash_{J \triangleright K} x_{2k}, x_{2k} \vdash_{J \triangleright K} n\} \\
\Leftrightarrow\ & m \vdash_J n \vee m \vdash_K n \vee m \diamondsuit_B n \vee m \diamondsuit_J n \vee m \diamondsuit_K n \text{ (by Lemma 2.6.1)} \\
\Leftrightarrow\ & m \vdash_{\mathcal{H}^\omega(J)} n \vee m \vdash_{\mathcal{H}^\omega(K)} n \vee m \diamondsuit_B n \\
\Leftrightarrow\ & m \vdash_{A \multimap B} n \vee m \vdash_{B \multimap C} n \vee m \diamondsuit_B n \\
\Leftrightarrow\ & m \vdash_A n \vee m \vdash_C n \vee (\star \vdash_C m \wedge \star \vdash_A n) \text{ (since } B \neq I) \\
\Leftrightarrow\ & m \vdash_{G_2} n
\end{aligned}$$

  (Note that even if $B = I$, then still the implication $\Rightarrow$ holds.)

- To show $P_{G_1} \subseteq P_{G_2}$, let $t \in P_{G_1}$, i.e., $t = \mathcal{H}^\omega(s)$ for some $s \in P_{J \triangleright K}$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
& s \in L_{J \triangleright K} \wedge s \restriction J \in P_J \wedge s \restriction K \in P_K \wedge s \restriction B_1, B_2 \in \mathrm{pr}_B \\
\Rightarrow\ & \mathcal{H}^\omega(s) \in L_{G_1} = L_{G_2} \wedge \mathcal{H}^\omega(s \restriction J) \in P_{A \multimap B_1} \wedge \mathcal{H}^\omega(s \restriction K) \in P_{B_2 \multimap C} \\
& \wedge \mathcal{H}^\omega(s \restriction B_1, B_2) \in \mathrm{pr}_B \\
\Rightarrow\ & t \in L_{G_2} \wedge t \restriction A \in P_A \wedge t \restriction C \in P_C \\
\Rightarrow\ & t \in P_{G_2}
\end{aligned}$$

□

Note that this is the "coarser" result, i.e., it is with respect to the *"countably iterated"* hiding operation $\mathcal{H}^\omega$ rather than the single operation $\mathcal{H}$. Now, we shall establish the "finer" one. We first need the following lemma:

Lemma 2.6.3 (Hiding external interaction 2)**.** Let J, K be fully dynamic games with $\mathcal{H}(J) = A \multimap B$ and $\mathcal{H}(K) = B \multimap C$. Then we have:

1. If J and K are both explicit, then

$$\mathcal{H}(J \triangleright K) = \mathcal{H}(A \overset{B}{\multimap} C)$$

2. If either J or K is not explicit, then

$$\mathcal{H}(J \triangleright K) \leqslant \mathcal{H}(J) \triangleright \mathcal{H}(K)$$

Proof. The equation 1 is by Proposition 2.4.26. Let us define $G_1 \overset{\text{df.}}{=} \mathcal{H}(J \triangleright K)$ and $G_2 \overset{\text{df.}}{=} \mathcal{H}(J) \triangleright \mathcal{H}(K)$. To show the inequation 2, assume that either J or K is not explicit; then B-moves in $J \triangleright K$ are j-internal with $j > 1$. Clearly, the sets of moves and the labeling functions of G_1 and G_2 coincide.

For the enabling relations, observe:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& m \vdash_{G_1} n \\
\Leftrightarrow\ & m \vdash_{J \triangleright K} n \vee \exists k \in \mathbb{N}^+, x_1, \ldots, x_{2k} \in M^1_{J \triangleright K}. m \vdash_{J \triangleright K} x_1, x_1 \vdash_{J \triangleright K} x_2, \\
& \ldots, x_{2k-1} \vdash_{J \triangleright K} x_{2k}, x_{2k} \vdash_{J \triangleright K} n \\
\Leftrightarrow\ & m \vdash_J n \vee m \vdash_K n \vee (\star \vdash_{B_2} m \wedge \star \vdash_{B_1} n) \\
& \vee \exists k \in \mathbb{N}^+, x_1, \ldots, x_{2k} \in M^1_J. m \vdash_J x_1, x_1 \vdash_J x_2, \ldots, x_{2k-1} \vdash_J x_{2k}, x_{2k} \vdash_J n \\
& \vee \exists k \in \mathbb{N}^+, x_1, \ldots, x_{2k} \in M^1_K. m \vdash_K x_1, x_1 \vdash_K x_2, \ldots, x_{2k-1} \vdash_K x_{2k}, x_{2k} \vdash_K n \\
& \text{(Note that } B\text{-moves are all } j\text{-internal with } j > 1.) \\
\Leftrightarrow\ & m \vdash_{J^h} n \vee m \vdash_{K^h} n \vee (\star \vdash_{B_2} m \wedge \star \vdash_{B_1} n) \\
\Leftrightarrow\ & m \vdash_{G_2} n
\end{aligned}
$$

For the valid positions, if $t \in P_{G_1}$, then $t = \mathcal{H}_{J \triangleright K}(s)$ for some $s \in P_{J \triangleright K}$. Then,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& s \in M^*_{J \triangleright K}, s \restriction J \in P_J, s \restriction K \in P_K, s \restriction B_1, B_2 \in \mathrm{Pr}_B \\
\Rightarrow\ & t \in M^*_{G_2}, \mathcal{H}_J(s \restriction J) \in P_{J^h}, \mathcal{H}_K(s \restriction K) \in P_{K^h}, t \restriction B_1, B_2 \in \mathrm{Pr}_B \\
\Rightarrow\ & t \in M^*_{G_2}, \mathcal{H}_{J \triangleright K}(s) \restriction J^h \in P_{J^h}, \mathcal{H}_{J \triangleright K}(s) \restriction K^h \in P_{K^h}, t \restriction B_1, B_2 \in \mathrm{Pr}_B \\
\Rightarrow\ & t \in M^*_{G_2}, t \restriction J^h \in P_{J^h}, t \restriction K^h \in P_{K^h}, t \restriction B_1, B_2 \in \mathrm{Pr}_B \\
\Rightarrow\ & t \in P_{G_2}
\end{aligned}
$$

establishing $P_{G_1} \subseteq P_{G_2}$.

Finally, it is easy to see that P_{G_1} satisfies the axioms (V1) and (V2). Thus, by Lemma 2.5.4, we have established the claim. □

Now we have:

Proposition 2.6.4 (Closure of full dynamism under external interaction)**.** The external interaction $J \triangleright K$ of games J and K, where $\mathcal{H}(J) = A \multimap B$ and $\mathcal{H}(K) = B \multimap C$, is fully dynamic if so are both J and K. Moreover, in this case, we have

$$\mathcal{H}^i(J \triangleright K) \leqslant \mathcal{H}^i(J) \triangleright \mathcal{H}^i(K)$$

for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. Assume that J and K are both fully dynamic. By Theorem 2.2.2 and Lemma 2.6.3, it suffices to show that $\mathcal{H}^i(J \triangleright K)$ forms a well-defined dynamic game for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$. If both J, K are explicit, i.e., $J = A \multimap B$ and $K = B \multimap C$, then by Proposition 2.6.2 and Lemma 2.6.3,

$$\mathcal{H}(J \triangleright K) = \mathcal{H}(A \overset{B}{\multimap} C) = \mathcal{H}^\omega(A \overset{B}{\multimap} C) = \mathcal{H}^\omega(J \triangleright K) \leqslant A \multimap C$$

Hence, in this case, $\mathcal{H}^i(J \triangleright K) = \mathcal{H}^\omega(J \triangleright K) \leqslant A \multimap C$ is a dynamic game for all $i \in \mathbb{N}^+$; so we are done.

If either J or K is not explicit, then by Lemma 2.6.3,

$$\mathcal{H}(J \triangleright K) \leqslant \mathcal{H}(J) \triangleright \mathcal{H}(K)$$

which is again a well-defined dynamic game. Observe, for any $i \in \mathbb{N}$, that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{H}^{i+1}(J \triangleright K) &= \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{H}^i(J \triangleright K)) \\
&\leqslant \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{H}^i(J) \triangleright \mathcal{H}^i(K)) \text{ (by the induction hypothesis)} \\
&\leqslant \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{H}^i(J)) \triangleright \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{H}^i(K)) \text{ (by what we have shown above)} \\
&= \mathcal{H}^{i+1}(J) \triangleright \mathcal{H}^{i+1}(K)
\end{aligned}$$

as long as either of $\mathcal{H}^i(J)$ or $\mathcal{H}^i(J)$ is not explicit, and $\mathcal{H}^{i+1}(J \triangleright K) \leqslant A \multimap C$ otherwise. Thus, we may conclude that $\mathcal{H}^i(J \triangleright K)$ is a dynamic game for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$, completing the proof. □

2.6.2 Homomorphism Theorem for Hiding on Games

Now, we present the homomorphism theorem:

Theorem 2.6.5 (Homomorphism theorem for hiding on games)**.** Let I be a finite "index set" and $\clubsuit$ a construction on games, which is not an external interaction. Then for any games $G_i, i \in I$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{H}^\omega(\clubsuit_{i \in I} G_i) &= \clubsuit_{i \in I} \mathcal{H}^\omega(G_i) \text{ for the arenas;} \\
\mathcal{H}^\omega(\clubsuit_{i \in I} G_i) &\leqslant \clubsuit_{i \in I} \mathcal{H}^\omega(G_i) \text{ for the games.}
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, if the games $G_i, i \in I$, are all fully dynamic, then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{H}(\clubsuit_{i \in I} G_i) &= \clubsuit_{i \in I} \mathcal{H}(G_i) \text{ for the arenas;} \\
\mathcal{H}(\clubsuit_{i \in I} G_i) &\leqslant \clubsuit_{i \in I} \mathcal{H}(G_i) \text{ for the games.}
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. We verify the claim only with respect to the operation $\mathcal{H}$; it is analogous to establish it with respect to the "coarser" operation $\mathcal{H}^\omega$. Let A, B be fully dynamic games.

Tensor product. We first show $\mathcal{H}(A \boxtimes B) \leqslant \mathcal{H}(A) \boxtimes \mathcal{H}(B)$.

Let $G_1 \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \mathcal{H}(A \boxtimes B)$ and $G_2 \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \mathcal{H}(A) \boxtimes \mathcal{H}(B)$. First, the sets of moves and the labeling functions of the two games G_1, G_2 clearly coincide.

For the enabling relation, by the definition, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
& m \vdash_{G_1} n \\
\Leftrightarrow\ & (m = \star \wedge \star \vdash_{A \boxtimes B} n) \vee (m \neq \star \wedge m \vdash_{A \boxtimes B} n) \\
& \vee m \neq \star \wedge \exists k \in \mathbb{N}^+.\ \exists x_1, \ldots, x_{2k} \in M^1_{A \boxtimes B}.\ m \vdash_{A \boxtimes B} x_1, x_1 \vdash_{A \boxtimes B} x_2, \ldots, \\
& \quad x_{2k-1} \vdash_{A \boxtimes B} x_{2k}, x_{2k} \vdash_{A \boxtimes B} n \\
\Leftrightarrow\ & \{m = \star \wedge (\star \vdash_A n \vee \star \vdash_B n)\} \vee \{m \neq \star \wedge (m \vdash_A n \vee m \vdash_B n)\} \\
& \vee m \neq \star \wedge \exists k \in \mathbb{N}^+.\ \exists x_1, \ldots, x_{2k} \in M^1_{A \boxtimes B}.\ \{(m \vdash_A x_1, x_1 \vdash_A x_2, \ldots, \\
& \quad x_{2k-1} \vdash_A x_{2k}, x_{2k} \vdash_A n) \vee (m \vdash_B x_1, x_1 \vdash_B x_2, \ldots, x_{2k-1} \vdash_B x_{2k}, x_{2k} \vdash_B n)\} \\
\Leftrightarrow\ & \{m = \star \wedge (\star \vdash_{A^h} n \vee \star \vdash_{B^h} n)\} \vee \{m \neq \star \wedge (m \vdash_{A^h} n \vee m \vdash_{B^h} n)\} \\
& \vee (m \neq \star \wedge \exists k \in \mathbb{N}^+.\ \exists x_1, \ldots, x_{2k} \in M^1_A.\ m \vdash_A x_1, x_1 \vdash_A x_2, \ldots, \\
& \quad x_{2k-1} \vdash_A x_{2k}, x_{2k} \vdash_A n) \\
& \vee (m \neq \star \wedge \exists k \in \mathbb{N}^+.\ \exists x_1, \ldots, x_{2k} \in M^1_B.\ m \vdash_B x_1, x_1 \vdash_B x_2, \ldots, \\
& \quad x_{2k-1} \vdash_B x_{2k}, x_{2k} \vdash_B n) \\
\Leftrightarrow\ & (m = \star \wedge \star \vdash_{A^h} n) \vee (m \neq \star \wedge m \vdash_{A^h} n) \\
& \vee (m \neq \star \wedge \exists k \in \mathbb{N}^+.\ \exists x_1, \ldots, x_{2k} \in M^1_A.\ m \vdash_A x_1, x_1 \vdash_A x_2, \ldots, \\
& \quad x_{2k-1} \vdash_A x_{2k}, x_{2k} \vdash_A n) \\
& \vee (m = \star \wedge \star \vdash_{B^h} n) \vee (m \neq \star \wedge m \vdash_{B^h} n) \\
& \vee (m \neq \star \wedge \exists k \in \mathbb{N}^+.\ \exists x_1, \ldots, x_{2k} \in M^1_B.\ m \vdash_B x_1, x_1 \vdash_B x_2, \ldots, \\
& \quad x_{2k-1} \vdash_B x_{2k}, x_{2k} \vdash_B n) \\
\Leftrightarrow\ & m \vdash_{A^h} n \vee m \vdash_{B^h} n \\
\Leftrightarrow\ & m \vdash_{G_2} n
\end{aligned}
$$

And for the valid positions, $P_{G_1} \subseteq P_{G_2}$ is easy to show: if $t \in P_{G_1}$, then

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \exists s \in L_{A \boxtimes B}.\, \mathcal{H}(s) = t \wedge s \upharpoonright A \in P_A \wedge s \upharpoonright B \in P_B \\
\Rightarrow\ & \exists s \in L_{A \boxtimes B}.\, \mathcal{H}(s) = t \wedge \mathcal{H}(s \upharpoonright A) \in P_{A^h} \wedge \mathcal{H}(s \upharpoonright B) \in P_{B^h} \\
\Rightarrow\ & \exists s \in L_{A \boxtimes B}.\, \mathcal{H}(s) = t \wedge \mathcal{H}(s) \upharpoonright A^h \in P_{A^h} \wedge \mathcal{H}(s) \upharpoonright B^h \in P_{B^h} \\
\Rightarrow\ & t \in L_{\mathcal{H}(A \boxtimes B)} \wedge t \upharpoonright A^h \in P_{A^h} \wedge t \upharpoonright B^h \in P_{B^h} \text{ (by Corollary 2.2.6)} \\
\Rightarrow\ & t \in L_{A^h \boxtimes B^h} \wedge t \upharpoonright A^h \in P_{A^h} \wedge t \upharpoonright B^h \in P_{B^h} \\
& \quad \text{(since the arenas } (A \boxtimes B)^h \text{ and } A^h \boxtimes B^h \text{ coincide)} \\
\Rightarrow\ & t \in P_{G_2}
\end{aligned}
$$

Linear implication. Next, we show $\mathcal{H}(A \rightsquigarrow B) \leqslant \mathcal{H}(A) \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{H}(B)$. Let us define $G_3 \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \mathcal{H}(A \rightsquigarrow B)$ and $G_4 \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \mathcal{H}(A) \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{H}(B)$.

First, the sets of moves and labeling functions of G_3, G_4 clearly coincide:

$$
\begin{aligned}
M_{G_3} &= M_{A^h} + M_{B^h} = M_{G_4} \\
\lambda_{G_3} &= [\overline{\lambda_{A^h}}, \lambda_{B^h}] = \lambda_{G_4}
\end{aligned}
$$

Next, for the enabling relation, observe that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& m \vdash_{G_3} n \\
\Leftrightarrow\ & (m = \star \wedge \star \vdash_{A \rightsquigarrow B} n) \vee (m \neq \star \wedge m \vdash_{A \rightsquigarrow B} n) \\
& \vee m \neq \star \wedge \exists k \in \mathbb{N}^+, \exists x_1, \ldots, x_{2k} \in M^1_{A \rightsquigarrow B}. m \vdash_{A \rightsquigarrow B} x_1, x_1 \vdash_{A \rightsquigarrow B} x_2, \\
& \ldots, x_{2k-1} \vdash_{A \rightsquigarrow B} x_{2k}, x_{2k} \vdash_{A \rightsquigarrow B} n \\
\Leftrightarrow\ & (m = \star \wedge \star \vdash_B n) \vee [m \neq \star \wedge \{m \vdash_A n \vee m \vdash_B n \vee (\star \vdash_B m \wedge \star \vdash_A n)\}] \\
& \vee m \neq \star \wedge \exists k \in \mathbb{N}^+, \exists x_1, \ldots, x_{2k} \in M^1_B. m \vdash_{A \rightsquigarrow B} x_1, x_1 \vdash_{A \rightsquigarrow B} x_2, \\
& \ldots, x_{2k-1} \vdash_{A \rightsquigarrow B} x_{2k}, x_{2k} \vdash_{A \rightsquigarrow B} n \\
\Leftrightarrow\ & (m = \star \wedge \star \vdash_{B^h} n) \vee [m \neq \star \wedge \{m \vdash_{A^h} n \vee m \vdash_B n \vee (\star \vdash_{B^h} m \wedge \star \vdash_{A^h} n)\}] \\
& \vee m \neq \star \wedge \exists k \in \mathbb{N}^+, \exists x_1, \ldots, x_{2k} \in M^1_B. m \vdash_B x_1, x_1 \vdash_B x_2, \ldots, \\
& x_{2k-1} \vdash_B x_{2k}, x_{2k} \vdash_B n \\
\Leftrightarrow\ & (m = \star \wedge \star \vdash_{B^h} n) \vee (m \neq \star \wedge m \vdash_{A^h} n) \vee (\star \vdash_{B^h} m \wedge \star \vdash_{A^h} n) \\
& \vee [m \neq \star \wedge \{m \vdash_B n \vee (\exists k \in \mathbb{N}^+, \exists x_1, \ldots, x_{2k} \in M^1_B. m \vdash_B x_1, x_1 \vdash_B x_2, \\
& \ldots,\ x_{2k-1} \vdash_B x_{2k}, x_{2k} \vdash_B n)\}] \\
\Leftrightarrow\ & (m = \star \wedge \star \vdash_{B^h} n) \vee (m \neq \star \wedge (m \vdash_{A^h} n) \vee (\star \vdash_{B^h} m \wedge \star \vdash_{A^h} n) \\
& \vee (m \neq \star \wedge m \vdash_{B^h} n) \\
\Leftrightarrow\ & m \vdash_{G_4} n
\end{aligned}
$$

Finally, $P_{G_3} \subseteq P_{G_4}$ is shown in the same way as the tensor product.

Product. We next show $\mathcal{H}(A \,\&\, B) \leqslant \mathcal{H}(A) \,\&\, \mathcal{H}(B)$. Let $G_5 \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \mathcal{H}(A \,\&\, B)$ and $G_6 \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \mathcal{H}(A) \,\&\, \mathcal{H}(B)$. Note that we may show that the arena parts of G_5, G_6 coincide exactly in the same way as the tensor product.

For the valid positions, observe that:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& t \in P_{G_5} \\
\Rightarrow\ & \exists s \in P_{A\&B}.\, t = \mathcal{H}(s) \\
\Rightarrow\ & \exists s \in L_{A\&B}.\, t = \mathcal{H}(s) \wedge \{(s \upharpoonright A \in P_A \wedge s \upharpoonright B = \epsilon) \vee (s \upharpoonright B \in P_B \wedge s \upharpoonright A = \epsilon)\} \\
\Rightarrow\ & \exists s \in L_{A\&B}.\, t = \mathcal{H}(s) \\
& \wedge \{(\mathcal{H}(s \upharpoonright A) \in P_{A^h} \wedge \mathcal{H}(s) \upharpoonright B^h = \epsilon) \vee (\mathcal{H}(s \upharpoonright B) \in P_{B^h} \wedge \mathcal{H}(s) \upharpoonright A^h = \epsilon)\} \\
\Rightarrow\ & \exists s \in L_{A\&B}.\, t = \mathcal{H}(s) \\
& \wedge \{(\mathcal{H}(s) \upharpoonright A^h \in P_{A^h} \wedge \mathcal{H}(s) \upharpoonright B^h = \epsilon) \vee (\mathcal{H}(s) \upharpoonright B^h \in P_{B^h} \wedge \mathcal{H}(s) \upharpoonright A^h = \epsilon)\} \\
\Rightarrow\ & \exists s \in L_{A\&B}.\, t = \mathcal{H}(s) \\
& \wedge \{(t \upharpoonright A^h \in P_{A^h} \wedge t \upharpoonright B^h = \epsilon) \vee (t \upharpoonright B^h \in P_{B^h} \wedge t \upharpoonright A^h = \epsilon)\} \\
\Rightarrow\ & t \in L_{\mathcal{H}(A\&B)}.\, (t \upharpoonright A^h \in P_{A^h} \wedge t \upharpoonright B^h = \epsilon) \vee (t \upharpoonright B^h \in P_{B^h} \wedge t \upharpoonright A^h = \epsilon) \\
& \text{(by Lemma 2.2.6)} \\
\Rightarrow\ & t \in L_{A^h \& B^h}.\, (t \upharpoonright A^h \in P_{A^h} \wedge t \upharpoonright B^h = \epsilon) \vee (t \upharpoonright B^h \in P_{B^h} \wedge t \upharpoonright A^h = \epsilon) \\
& \text{(since the arenas } G_5 \text{ and } G_6 \text{ coincide)} \\
\Rightarrow\ & t \in P_{G_6}
\end{aligned}
$$

establishing $P_{G_5} \subseteq P_{G_6}$.

Tailed product. Similar to the (ordinary) product.

Exponential. Finally, we show $\mathcal{H}(!A) \leqslant !\mathcal{H}(A)$. By the definition, the arena parts of $\mathcal{H}(!A)$ and $!\mathcal{H}(A)$ coincide.

For the valid positions, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
& t \in P_{\mathcal{H}(!A)} \\
\Rightarrow\ & \exists s \in P_{!A}.\, t = \mathcal{H}(s) \\
\Rightarrow\ & \exists s \in L_{!A}.\, t = \mathcal{H}(s) \wedge s \upharpoonright m \in P_A \text{ for each initial occurrence } m \\
\Rightarrow\ & \exists s \in L_A.\, t = \mathcal{H}(s) \wedge \mathcal{H}(s \upharpoonright m) \in P_{A^h} \text{ for each initial occurrence } m \\
\Rightarrow\ & \exists s \in L_A.\, t = \mathcal{H}(s) \wedge \mathcal{H}(s) \upharpoonright m \in P_{A^h} \text{ for each initial occurrence } m \\
\Rightarrow\ & t \in L_{A^h}.\, t \upharpoonright m \in P_{A^h} \text{ for each initial occurrence } m \\
\Rightarrow\ & t \in L_{!A^h}.\, t \upharpoonright m \in P_{A^h} \text{ for each initial occurrence } m \\
\Rightarrow\ & t \in P_{!A^h}
\end{aligned}
$$

establishing $P_{\mathcal{H}(!A)} \subseteq P_{!\mathcal{H}(A)}$. □

Remark 2.6.6. We cannot establish equations for the above homomorphism theorem; (which is why we only showed the subgame relations). The reason is as follows: A play s of the game $\clubsuit_{i=1}^2 \mathcal{H}(G_i)$ is a mixture of plays $\mathcal{H}(t), \mathcal{H}(u)$, where $t \in P_{G_1}, u \in P_{G_2}$, with some constraints. However, when mixing up t and u, to form a play v in $\clubsuit_{i=1}^2 G_i$ such that $\mathcal{H}(v) = s$, there may be more

constraints (especially the visibility condition) because of the internal moves; so there may not exist such a play v, which indicates that we may not have $\clubsuit_{i=1}^{2}\mathcal{H}(G_i) \leqslant \mathcal{H}(\clubsuit_{i=1}^{2}G_i)$.

3 Dynamic Strategies

In this section, we introduce the notion of strategies on dynamic games, which are called *dynamic strategies*.

3.1 Dynamic Strategies

Definition 3.1.1 (Dynamic strategies)**.** A **dynamic strategy** σ on a dynamic game G is a set of even-length valid positions of G, satisfying the following conditions:

(S1) It is non-empty and "even-prefix-closed":

$$smn \in \sigma \Rightarrow s \in \sigma$$

(S2) It is deterministic:

$$smn, smn' \in \sigma \Rightarrow n = n' \wedge \mathcal{J}_{smn}(n) = \mathcal{J}_{s'm'n'}(n')$$

(DS3) It is deterministic (or consistent) on external moves:

$$\begin{aligned} & smn, s'm'n' \in \sigma \wedge \lambda^{\mathbb{N}}_G(n) = \lambda^{\mathbb{N}}_G(n') = 0 \wedge \mathcal{H}^{\omega}_G(sm) = \mathcal{H}^{\omega}_G(s'm') \\ \Rightarrow\ & n = n' \wedge \mathcal{J}^{\ominus\omega}_{smn}(n) = \mathcal{J}^{\ominus\omega}_{s'm'n'}(n') \end{aligned}$$

We often call a dynamic strategy just a **strategy**. We write $\sigma : G$ to indicate that σ is a well-defined strategy on the game G.

Dually to games, we have the notion of *fully dynamic strategies*

Definition 3.1.2 (Fully dynamic strategies)**.** A dynamic strategy $\sigma : G$ is said to be **fully dynamic**, if G is a fully dynamic game and σ additionally satisfies the following condition:

(FDS3) For any $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and $smn, s'm'n' \in \sigma$,

$$\begin{aligned} & (\lambda^{\mathbb{N}}_G(n) = \lambda^{\mathbb{N}}_G(n') = 0 \vee \lambda^{\mathbb{N}}_G(n), \lambda^{\mathbb{N}}_G(n') > i) \wedge \mathcal{H}^{i}_G(sm) = \mathcal{H}^{i}_G(s'm') \\ & \Rightarrow n = n' \wedge \mathcal{J}^{\ominus i}_{smn}(n) = \mathcal{J}^{\ominus i}_{s'm'n'}(n') \end{aligned}$$

Note that the axiom (FDS3) implies the axiom (DS3).

Example 3.1.3. There is just one strategy for the empty game I: the empty strategy $\bot = \{\epsilon\}$. For each natural number n, we have a strategy $n = \{\epsilon, qn\}$ for the natural numbers game N.

In the usual HO-games, a strategy is a set of even-length valid positions satisfying the axioms (S1) and (S2). However, in fact, the "dynamic" property of strategies is inherited from that of games:

Proposition 3.1.4 (Strategies on dynamic games)**.** Every strategy σ that is not necessarily (resp. fully) dynamic on a (resp. fully) dynamic game G is (resp. fully) dynamic.

Proof. We first establish the dynamic case. Let $smn, s'm'n' \in \sigma$, where n, n' are external and $\mathcal{H}^\omega(sm) = \mathcal{H}^\omega(s'm')$. Then by the axioms (V3) for G and (S2) for σ, we have $sm = s'm'$. Then by (S2) for σ, $n = n'$, and also, from $\mathcal{J}(n) = \mathcal{J}(n')$ with $sm = s'm'$, we may conclude that $\mathcal{J}^{\ominus\omega}(n) = \mathcal{J}^{\ominus\omega}(n')$.

Next, we show the fully dynamic case, but it is very similar, using the axioms of generalized (V3) and (S2). □

It is straightforward to see that if $\sigma : G$ and $G \leqslant H$, then we have $\sigma : H$ too. Also, a strategy $\sigma : G$ can be seen as a particular subgame of a well-opened game G. To establish this fact, we need the following definition:

Definition 3.1.5 (Strategies as games)**.** Let σ be a strategy on a game G. We then define

$$(\overline{\sigma})_G \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \sigma \cup \{s.m \in P_G \mid s \in \sigma\}$$

and call it the **game-form** of σ with respect to G.

We often omit the subscript G and just write $\overline{\sigma}$ when the underlying game G is obvious. Clearly, we may recover σ from $\overline{\sigma}$ by removing all the odd-length plays. Thus, σ and $\overline{\sigma}$ are essentially the same, just in different forms.

Now we establish:

Proposition 3.1.6 (Strategies as subgames)**.** For any strategy σ on a well-opened game G, the structure $(M_G, \lambda_G, \vdash_G, (\overline{\sigma})_G)$ is a subgame of G.

Proof. By Lemma 2.5.4, it suffices to verify the axioms (V1) and (V2).

(V1) Clearly, $\overline{\sigma}$ is non-empty, because so is σ and $\sigma \subseteq \overline{\sigma}$. Next, we show that $\overline{\sigma}$ is prefix-closed. Assume $sa \in \overline{\sigma}$; we have to show $s \in \overline{\sigma}$.

- If s is of even-length, then $s \in \sigma \subseteq \overline{\sigma}$.
- If s is of odd-length, then it is in the form of $s = tb$, and $tba \in \sigma$. Thus, $t \in \sigma$ and $tb \in P_G$, from which we conclude that $s = tb \in \overline{\sigma}$.

(V2) Let $s \in \overline{\sigma}$ and I a set of initial occurrences in s. We have to show $s \restriction I \in \overline{\sigma}$. Note that since G is well-opened, we have either $s \restriction I = \epsilon$ or $s \restriction I = s$. In either case, we clearly have $s \restriction I \in \overline{\sigma}$.

□

In this sense, a strategy $\sigma : G$ is essentially a subgame of G if G is well-opened. We usually write $(\overline{\sigma})_G$ or even $\overline{\sigma}$ for the subgame established above; thus the proposition may be informally expressed as: $\overline{\sigma} \leqslant G$ if $\sigma : G$ and G is well-opened.

Next, we establish some technical lemma, which will be used later. In the axiom (DS3), the sequences $\mathcal{H}^\omega(sm)$ and $\mathcal{H}^\omega(s'm')$ should be seen as "external inputs" for the strategy σ; thus in particular, they must be of odd-length. In fact, a stronger property holds:

Lemma 3.1.7 (Closure of odd-length under hiding)**.** Let G be an arena and $s \in L_G$ with $\mathrm{odd}\{s\}$. Then we have $\mathrm{odd}\{\mathcal{H}(s)\}$.

Proof. By a case analysis on the last move of s.

- Assume s ends with a non-1-internal move. Note that, by the alternation and EI-switch conditions, the 1-internal moves in s occurs as even-length segments between non-1-internal moves. Hence the number of 1-internal moves in s must be even, which implies that the length of $\mathcal{H}(s)$ is odd.
- Assume s ends with a 1-internal move. We may write

  $$s = tmx_1 \dots x_k$$

  where m is the rightmost non-1-internal move in s, $k \in \mathbb{N}^+$, and $x_1, \dots, x_k$ are all 1-internal moves. Again by the alternation and EI-conditions, k must be even, and the number of 1-internal moves in t is even. Thus we conclude that the total number of 1-internal moves in s is even, which implies that the length of $\mathcal{H}(s)$ is odd.

□

Remark 3.1.8. On the other hand, the property of "being of even-length" is not preserved under the hiding operation. This asymmetry is reflected in the definition of the hiding operation on strategies below.

Next, we define the notion of "substrategies", which is analogous to the notion of subgames.

Definition 3.1.9 (Substrategies)**.** Let $\sigma, \tau : G$ be strategies. We say that σ is a **substrategy** of τ, writing $\sigma \leqslant_G \tau$, if $\sigma \subseteq \tau$.

Clearly, a substrategy of a (resp. fully) dynamic strategy is again (resp. fully) dynamic. We often write $\sigma \leqslant \tau : G$ or just $\sigma \leqslant \tau$ if $\sigma, \tau : G$ and $\sigma \leqslant_G \tau$. The obvious connection between the notions of substrategies and subgames is the following:

Proposition 3.1.10 (Substrategies as subgames)**.** For any strategies $\sigma, \tau : G$, we have

$$\sigma \leqslant \tau \Leftrightarrow \overline{\sigma} \leqslant \overline{\tau}$$

Proof. Immediate from the definition. □

3.2 Hiding Operation on Strategies

We now define the hiding operation $\mathcal{H}$ on dynamic strategies (we use the same symbol as that for the hiding operation on games, but a confusion should not occur in practice). As one of the main results, we shall establish the "typing-preservation theorem":

$$\sigma : G \Rightarrow \mathcal{H}(\sigma) : \mathcal{H}(G)$$

Let us begin by defining the hiding operation on strategies. It is slightly more complex than the case of games because of the asymmetry of the preservation property of "odd-length" and "even-length" of plays under hiding.

Definition 3.2.1 (Hiding operation on strategies)**.** Let G be a game, and s a valid position in G. We define $s \upharpoonright \mathcal{H}^0_G \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} s$; also for $d \in \mathbb{N}^+$ and $d = \omega$,

$$s \upharpoonright \mathcal{H}^d_G \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \begin{cases} \mathcal{H}^d_G(s) & \text{if } s \text{ is a } d\text{-complete play;} \\ t \text{ with } tm = \mathcal{H}^d_G(s) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The **hiding operation** $\mathcal{H}^d$ of degree d (or d**-hiding operation** for short), where $d \in \mathbb{N}$ or $d = \omega$, on strategies is defined by

$$\mathcal{H}^d : (\sigma : G) \mapsto \{ s \upharpoonright \mathcal{H}^d_G \mid s \in \sigma \}$$

We often omit the subscript G in the operation $\upharpoonright H^d_G$. We proceed to establish a useful technical lemma:

Lemma 3.2.2 (Hiding lemma on strategies)**.** Let $\sigma : G$, and $i \in \mathbb{N}^+$ or $i = \omega$. Assume $smn \in \mathcal{H}^i(\sigma)$, where $tmunv \upharpoonright \mathcal{H}^i = smn$ with $tmunv \in \sigma$. Then,

$$smn = \mathcal{H}^i(tmun) = \mathcal{H}^i(t).mn$$

Proof. By a case analysis on v.

- If $v = \epsilon$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} smn &= tmun \upharpoonright \mathcal{H}^i \\ &= \mathcal{H}^i(tmun) \\ &= \mathcal{H}^i(t).m.\mathcal{H}^i(u).n \\ &= \mathcal{H}^i(t).mn \end{aligned}$$

  where note that $\mathcal{H}^i(u) = \epsilon$.

- If $v \neq \epsilon$, then v is in the form of $v = v_1 l v_2$, where $\lambda^{\mathbb{N}}_G(l) > i \vee \lambda^{\mathbb{N}}_G(l) = 0$ and v_1, v_2 are sequences of d-internal moves with $d \leqslant i$ and $v_2 \neq \epsilon$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} smn &= tmunv_1 l v_2 \upharpoonright \mathcal{H}^i \\ &= \mathcal{H}^i(tmunv_1) \\ &= \mathcal{H}^i(tmun) \\ &= \mathcal{H}^i(t).m.\mathcal{H}^i(u).n \\ &= \mathcal{H}^i(t).mn \end{aligned}$$

  where note that $\mathcal{H}^i(u) = \epsilon$.

□

Now we are ready to show the "typing-preservation theorem", which in some sense indicates that our definition of the hiding operation is correct:

Theorem 3.2.3 (Typing preservation theorem)**.** For a dynamic strategy $\sigma : G$,

1. $\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma) : \mathcal{H}^\omega(G)$, i.e., $\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma)$ is a well-defined dynamic strategy on the dynamic game $\mathcal{H}^\omega(G)$;
2. Moreover, if σ is fully dynamic, then $\mathcal{H}^d(\sigma) : \mathcal{H}^d(G)$ for all $d \in \mathbb{N}$, where $\mathcal{H}^d(\sigma)$ is again fully dynamic.

Proof. We establish only the clause 2; it is very similar to verify the clause 1. The case $d = 0$ is trivial; so assume that $d \in \mathbb{N}^+$, and $\sigma : G$ is fully dynamic.

We first show that $\mathcal{H}^d(\sigma)$ is a set of even-length valid positions of the game $\mathcal{H}^d(G)$, i.e., for any $s \in \sigma$, we have $s \upharpoonright \mathcal{H}^d_G \in P_{\mathcal{H}^d(G)}$ and $\mathrm{even}\{s \upharpoonright \mathcal{H}^d_G\}$.

- Note that $s \in \sigma \subseteq P_G$. If s is d-complete, then $s \upharpoonright \mathcal{H}^d_G = \mathcal{H}^d_G(s) \in P_{\mathcal{H}^d(G)}$ by the definition. So we assume s is not d-complete; but again by the definition, $s \upharpoonright \mathcal{H}^d_G \in P_{\mathcal{H}^d(G)}$ is immediate, because $P_{\mathcal{H}^d(G)}$ is prefix-closed.
- Next, we show that $s \upharpoonright \mathcal{H}^d_G$ is of even-length. If s is d-complete, then by the alternation and EI-switch conditions for G, j-internal moves in s with $j \leqslant d$ occur as even-length segments between other moves; thus the total number of such j-internal moves in s must be even. Since s is of even-length, we conclude that $s \upharpoonright \mathcal{H}^d_G = \mathcal{H}^d_G(s)$ is of even length. If s is not d-complete, say $s = s_1.m.x_1 \dots x_k$, where m is the rightmost move in s such that $\lambda^{\mathbb{N}}_G(m) = 0 \vee \lambda^{\mathbb{N}}_G(m) > d$ and $x_1 \dots x_k$ are j-internal moves with $j \leqslant d$, then again by the alternation and EI-switch conditions, k must be odd and the number of j-internal ($j \leqslant d$) moves in s_1 is even, so the total number of such j-internal moves in s is odd. Thus, the length of $\mathcal{H}^d_G(s)$ is odd, which means the length of $s \upharpoonright \mathcal{H}^d_G$ is even.

Next, we show the axioms (S1), (S2) and (FDS3).

(S1) Non-emptiness is trivial because $\epsilon \in \mathcal{H}^d(\sigma)$. For even-prefix-closure, let $smn \in \mathcal{H}^d(\sigma)$; we have to show $s \in \mathcal{H}^d(\sigma)$. Then we have some $tmunv \in \sigma$ with $smn = tmunv \upharpoonright \mathcal{H}^d_G$. By Lemma 3.2.2, we have $smn = \mathcal{H}^d_G(t).mn$, whence $s = \mathcal{H}^d_G(t)$. Note that, by the alternation and EI-switch conditions, t must be a d-complete play; thus $s = \mathcal{H}^d_G(t) = t \upharpoonright \mathcal{H}^d_G \in \mathcal{H}^d(\sigma)$.

(S2) Assume $smn, smn' \in \mathcal{H}^d_G(\sigma)$; we have to show $n = n'$ and $\mathcal{J}^{\ominus d}(n) = \mathcal{J}^{\ominus d}(n')$. By the definition, there are some $tmunv, t'mu'n'v' \in \sigma$ such that $tmunv \upharpoonright \mathcal{H}^d_G = smn$ and $t'mu'n'v' \upharpoonright \mathcal{H}^d_G = smn'$. It suffices to show $\mathcal{H}^d_G(tmu) = \mathcal{H}^d_G(t'mu')$ because of the axiom (FDS3) for σ. By Lemma 3.2.2, we now have

$$smn = tmunv \upharpoonright \mathcal{H}^d_G = \mathcal{H}^d_G(t).mn$$
$$smn' = t'mu'n'v' \upharpoonright \mathcal{H}^d_G = \mathcal{H}^d_G(t').mn'$$

and $\mathcal{H}^d_G(u) = \mathcal{H}^d_G(u') = \epsilon$. Therefore, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{H}^d_G(tmu) &= \mathcal{H}^d_G(t).m \\ &= sm \\ &= \mathcal{H}^d_G(t').m \\ &= \mathcal{H}^d_G(t'mu')\end{aligned}$$

(FDS3) We have to show that $\mathcal{H}^d(\sigma)$ satisfies the axiom (FDS3). Note that we have already established the relation $\mathcal{H}^d(\sigma) : \mathcal{H}^d(G)$. Let $i \in \mathbb{N}$, $smn, s'm'n' \in \mathcal{H}^d_G(\sigma)$, $\lambda^{\mathbb{N}}_{\mathcal{H}^d(G)}(n), \lambda^{\mathbb{N}}_{\mathcal{H}^d(G)}(n') > i \vee \lambda^{\mathbb{N}}_{\mathcal{H}^d(G)}(n) = \lambda^{\mathbb{N}}_{\mathcal{H}^d(G)}(n') = 0$ and $\mathcal{H}^i_{\mathcal{H}^d(G)}(sm) = \mathcal{H}^i_{\mathcal{H}^d(G)}(s'm')$. We have to show $n = n'$ and $\mathcal{J}^{\ominus i}_{smn}(n) = \mathcal{J}^{\ominus i}_{s'm'n'}(n')$. Again, there are $tmunv, t'mu'n'v' \in \sigma$ with $tmunv \upharpoonright \mathcal{H}^d_G = smn$ and $t'mu'n'v' \upharpoonright \mathcal{H}^d_G = s'm'n'$. Again by Lemma 3.2.2, $\mathcal{H}^d_G(tmu) = sm$ and $\mathcal{H}^d_G(t'm'u') = s'm'$. We now have $tmun, t'm'u'n' \in \sigma$ with $\lambda^{\mathbb{N}}_G(n), \lambda^{\mathbb{N}}_G(n') > i+d \vee \lambda^{\mathbb{N}}_G(n) = \lambda^{\mathbb{N}}_G(n') = 0$ and $\mathcal{H}^{i+d}_G(tmu) = \mathcal{H}^i_{\mathcal{H}^d(G)}(sm) = \mathcal{H}^i_{\mathcal{H}^d(G)}(s'm') = \mathcal{H}^{i+d}_G(t'm'u')$. Hence by (FDS3) for σ on $i+d$, we have $n = n'$ and

$$\mathcal{J}^{\ominus i}_{smn}(n) = \mathcal{J}^{\ominus(i+d)}_{tmun}(n) = \mathcal{J}^{\ominus(i+d)}_{t'm'u'n''}(n') = \mathcal{J}^{\ominus i}_{s'm'n'}(n')$$

□

As a corollary, we have:

Corollary 3.2.4 (Closure of strategies under hiding)**.** The collection of dynamic strategies is closed under the ω-hiding operation $\mathcal{H}^\omega$. Moreover, the sub-collection of fully dynamic strategies is closed under the d-hiding operation $\mathcal{H}^d$ for all $d \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. By Theorem 3.2.3. □

Also, similar to the case of games, we define:

Definition 3.2.5 (Explicit strategies)**.** A strategy σ is said to be **explicit** if $\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma) = \sigma$.

Definition 3.2.6 (External equality between strategies)**.** Strategies σ, τ on the same game are said to be **externally equal**, written $\sigma \approx \tau$, if $\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma) = \mathcal{H}^\omega(\tau)$.

For any strategy $\sigma : G$, if a play $s \in \sigma$ ends with an internal move, then it can be seen in an unfinished process of computing the next external move. This observation motivates the following definition.

Notation 3.2.7. Let $\sigma : G$ be a dynamic strategy. For each $d \in \mathbb{N}$, we write $\sigma^d_\downarrow$ for the subset of σ which consists of d-complete plays; we also define $\sigma^d_\uparrow \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \sigma \setminus \sigma^d_\downarrow$. Moreover, we write $\sigma_\downarrow$ for the subset of σ which consists of fully complete plays; and we define $\sigma_\uparrow \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \sigma \setminus \sigma_\downarrow$

We have immediate but useful lemmata:

Lemma 3.2.8 (Hiding and complete plays)**.** Let $\sigma : G$ be a fully dynamic strategy. For any natural numbers $i, d \in \mathbb{N}$ with $i \geqslant d$,

$$\mathcal{H}^i(\sigma^d_{\downarrow}) = \mathcal{H}^i(\sigma)$$

where $\mathcal{H}^i(\sigma^d_{\downarrow}) \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \{ s \restriction \mathcal{H}^i_G \mid s \in \sigma^d_{\downarrow} \}$ (note that $\sigma^d_{\downarrow}$ may not be a strategy).

Proof. One direction $\mathcal{H}^i(\sigma^d_{\downarrow}) \subseteq \mathcal{H}^i(\sigma)$ is clear. For the other direction, let $s \restriction \mathcal{H}^i_G \in \mathcal{H}^i(\sigma)$; we have to show $s \restriction \mathcal{H}^i_G \in \mathcal{H}^i(\sigma^d_{\downarrow})$.

If $s \in \sigma^d_{\downarrow}$, then we are done; so assume otherwise. Also, if there are no external or k-internal move with $k > i$ in s other than the first move l, then $s \restriction \mathcal{H}^i_G = \epsilon \in \mathcal{H}^i(\sigma^d_{\downarrow})$; so assume otherwise. Then we may write

$$s = l.s_1.m.n.s_2$$

where $s_2 \neq \epsilon$ consists only of j-internal moves with $j \leqslant i$, and m, n are external or k-internal ($k > i$) P-move and O-move, respectively. We then take $l.s_1.m \in \sigma^d_{\downarrow}$, so that $s \restriction \mathcal{H}^i_G = \mathcal{H}^i_G(l.s_1).m = l.s_1.m \restriction \mathcal{H}^i_G \in \mathcal{H}^i(\sigma^d_{\downarrow})$. □

We are then ready to show:

Proposition 3.2.9 (Hiding on strategies in the iterated form)**.** Let $\sigma : G$ be a fully dynamic strategy. Then we have

$$\mathcal{H}^{i+1}(\sigma) = \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{H}^i(\sigma))$$

for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. We first show the inclusion $\mathcal{H}^{i+1}(\sigma) \subseteq \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{H}^i(\sigma))$. By Lemma 3.2.8, any element of $\mathcal{H}^{i+1}(\sigma)$ may be written in ther form $s \restriction \mathcal{H}^{i+1}_G$ with $s \in \sigma^{i+1}_{\downarrow}$. Then observe that

$$\begin{aligned} s \restriction \mathcal{H}^{i+1}_G &= \mathcal{H}^{i+1}_G(s) \\ &= \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{H}^i(G)}(\mathcal{H}^i_G(s)) \text{ (by Proposition 2.1.12)} \\ &= (s \restriction \mathcal{H}^i_G) \restriction \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{H}^i(G)} \text{ (since } s \in \sigma^{i+1}_{\downarrow}) \\ &\in \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{H}^i(\sigma)) \end{aligned}$$

For the opposite inclusion, again by Lemma 3.2.8, we may choose, as an arbitrary element of $\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{H}^i(\sigma))$, any $(s \restriction \mathcal{H}^i_G) \restriction \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{H}^i(G)}$ with $s \in \sigma^i_{\downarrow}$. We have to show that $(s \restriction \mathcal{H}^i_G) \restriction \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{H}^i(G)} \in \mathcal{H}^{i+1}(\sigma)$. If $s \in \sigma^{i+1}_{\downarrow}$, then it is completely analogous to the above argument. Also, if an external or j-internal ($j > i{+}1$) O-move in s is only the first move, then we have $(s \restriction \mathcal{H}^i_G) \restriction \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{H}^i(G)} = \epsilon \in \mathcal{H}^{i+1}(\sigma)$. Hence, we assume that s contains more than one such moves, and ends with an $(i{+}1)$-internal move; then we may write

$$s = s'.m.n.x_1 \ldots x_{2k}.y$$

where y is an (i+1)-internal P-move, $x_1, \ldots, x_{2k}$ are l-internal with $l \leqslant i{+}1$, and m, n are external or j-internal, with $j > i{+}1$, P- and O- moves, respectively. Then, observe that

$$\begin{aligned}(s \restriction \mathcal{H}^i_G) \restriction \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{H}^i(G)} &= \mathcal{H}^i_G(s) \restriction \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{H}^i(G)} \\ &= \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{H}^i(G)}(\mathcal{H}^i_G(s')).m \\ &= \mathcal{H}^{i+1}_G(s').m \text{ (by Proposition 2.1.12)} \\ &= s \restriction \mathcal{H}^{i+1}_G \\ &\in \mathcal{H}^{i+1}(\sigma)\end{aligned}$$

□

By this result, like hiding on games, the i-hiding operation $\mathcal{H}^i$ on strategies can be seen as the i-times iteration of the 1-hiding operation $\mathcal{H} \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \mathcal{H}^1$.

Next, we establish:

Lemma 3.2.10 (Hiding on legal positions in second form)**.** For any dynamic arena G, we have:

1. $L_{\mathcal{H}^\omega(G)} = \{ s \restriction \mathcal{H}^\omega_G \mid s \in L_G \}$;
2. $L^{\mathrm{fd}}_{\mathcal{H}^i(G)} = \{ s \restriction \mathcal{H}^i_G \mid s \in L^{\mathrm{fd}}_G \}$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$, if G is fully dynamic.

Proof. We shall establish only the equation 2; it is analogous to show the equation 1. Observe that:

$$\begin{aligned}\{ s \restriction \mathcal{H}^i_G \mid s \in L^{\mathrm{fd}}_G \} &= \{ s \restriction \mathcal{H}^i_G \mid s \in L^{\mathrm{fd}}_G, s \text{ is } i\text{-complete} \} \\ &\quad (\supseteq \text{ is clear; } \subseteq \text{ is by the prefix-closure of the set of legal positions}) \\ &= \{ \mathcal{H}^i_G(s) \mid s \in L^{\mathrm{fd}}_G, s \text{ is } i\text{-complete} \} \\ &= \{ \mathcal{H}^i_G(s) \mid s \in L^{\mathrm{fd}}_G \} \text{ (by the same argument as above)} \\ &= L^{\mathrm{fd}}_{\mathcal{H}^i(G)} \text{ (by Corollary 2.2.6)}\end{aligned}$$

□

Next, as expected, the hiding operations on games and strategies interact well with each other in the following sense:

Lemma 3.2.11 (Hiding on games and strategies)**.** Let $\sigma : G$ be a dynamic strategy, where G is well-opened. Then we have

1. $\mathcal{H}^\omega((\overline{\sigma})_G) \leqslant (\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma)})_{\mathcal{H}^\omega(G)}$;
2. $\mathcal{H}^i((\overline{\sigma})_G) \leqslant (\overline{\mathcal{H}^i(\sigma)})_{\mathcal{H}^i(G)}$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$ if σ is fully dynamic.

Proof. We establish only the clause 2; it is analogous to show the clause 1. By Propositions 3.2.9 and 2.5.5, it suffices to focus on the case $i = 1$. First, note that the arena parts of the games on both sides of the subgame relation coincide with the arena $\mathcal{H}(G)$. Thus, it remains to show $\mathcal{H}(\overline{\sigma}) \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{H}(\sigma)}$.

Let $s \in \mathcal{H}(\overline{\sigma})$, i.e., $s = \mathcal{H}(t)$ for some $t \in \overline{\sigma}$. If $t = \epsilon$, then it is trivial; so assume otherwise. Without loss of generality, we may assume that t is a 1-complete play. we proceed by a case analysis.

- Assume $t \in \sigma$. Since t ends with a non-1-internal move,

  $$s = \mathcal{H}(t) = t \upharpoonright \mathcal{H} \in \mathcal{H}(\sigma) \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{H}(\sigma)}$$

  so we have $s \in \overline{\mathcal{H}(\sigma)}$.

- Assume $t = vn$, for some $v \in \sigma$ and $vn \in P_G$, where n is not 1-internal. Note that v must end with a non-1-internal move by the EI-switch condition. Thus, writing $s = s'n$, we have

  $$s' = \mathcal{H}(v) = v \upharpoonright \mathcal{H} \in \mathcal{H}(\sigma)$$

  Also, note that $s'n = s \in \mathcal{H}(\overline{\sigma}) \subseteq P_{\mathcal{H}(G)}$ by Proposition 2.5.5. Therefore, we conclude that $s = s'n \in \overline{\mathcal{H}(\sigma)}$.

□

3.3 Normal Form and External Equality

Similar to games, we define:

Definition 3.3.1 (Normal form of strategies)**.** A strategy $\sigma : G$ is said to be in **normal form** if $\mathcal{H}(\sigma) = \sigma$.

Definition 3.3.2 (Extensional equality between strategies)**.** Strategies σ, τ on the same dynamic game are said to be **extenally equal** and written $\sigma \approx \tau$ if $\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma) = \mathcal{H}^\omega(\tau)$.

3.4 Constructions on Strategies

In this section, we recall the basic strategies and various constructions on strategies in the literature (e.g., see [HO00, AJM00, McC98]). Moreover, we introduce some of the new constructions.

We then show that the basic strategies satisfy the additional axioms for (resp. *fully*) *dynamic* strategies, and the constructions preserve them. Therefore, the notion of (resp. fully) dynamic strategies will accommodate all the basic strategies and constructions in the literature, plus the new constructions.

3.4.1 Copy-cat Strategies

One of the most basic strategies is the so-called *copy-cat* strategies, which basically copy and paste the last O-moves.

Definition 3.4.1 (Copy-cat strategies [AJ94])**.** The **copy-cat strategy** cp_A on an explicit game A is defined to be the following set of even-length valid positions of A:

$$\mathrm{cp}_A \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \{s \in \mathrm{pr}_A \mid \mathrm{even}\{s\}\}$$

where $\mathrm{pr}_A \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \{s \in P_{A_1 \multimap A_2} \mid \forall t \preceq s.\ \mathrm{even}\{t\} \to t \upharpoonright A_1 = t \upharpoonright A_2\}$, and the subscripts in A are to distinguish the two copies of A. Note that the condition $t \upharpoonright A_1 = t \upharpoonright A_2$ includes the equality of the pointers too.

As expected, copy-cat strategies are fully dynamic:

Proposition 3.4.2 (Fully dynamic copy-cat strategies)**.** The copy-cat strategy cp_A on an explicit game A forms a well-defined fully dynamic strategy on the game $A \multimap A$.

Proof. The fact that a copy-cat strategy forms a well-defined strategy has been established in the literature (e.g., see [McC98]); thus it remains to show the condition (FDS3). However, since A is required to be explicit, it is equivalent to the condition (S2); so we are done. □

Remark 3.4.3. For the copy-cat strategy cp_A, the game A must be explicit, since otherwise the linear implication $A \multimap A$ would not be a well-defined dynamic game. Also, cp_A cannot be a strategy on the game $A^h \multimap A$ either, because a play in A^h may not be a play in A.

3.4.2 Non-hiding Composition

To formulate the *standard* notion of composition, it is convenient to first define the following intermediate concept:

Definition 3.4.4 (Non-hiding composition)**.** Given strategies $\sigma : A \multimap B$ and $\tau : B \multimap C$, where A, B, C are explicit, we define their **non-hiding composition** $\sigma \ddagger \tau$ to be the following set of sequences:

$$\sigma \ddagger \tau \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \{s \in M^* \mid s \upharpoonright A, B_1 \in \sigma, s \upharpoonright B_2, C \in \tau, s \upharpoonright B_1, B_2 \in \mathrm{pr}_B\}$$

where $M \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} M_A + M_{B_1} + M_{B_2} + M_C$, and B_1, B_2 are just two copies of B.

In the literature, it is rather called the *parallel composition*, and it is only a preliminary definition for the *official* composition of the category of games and strategies; however, we proposed a different name here because it will play rather a fundamental role in this paper.

We first introduce the following lemma which is well-known in the literature:

Lemma 3.4.5 (Covering lemma [A$^+$97])**.** Let $\sigma : A \multimap B$ and $\tau : B \multimap C$ be strategies, where A, B, C are explicit. Then the operation

$$(s \in \sigma \ddagger \tau) \mapsto s \upharpoonright A, C$$

forms a bijection $\psi : \sigma \ddagger \tau \to \{s \upharpoonright A, C \mid s \in \sigma \ddagger \tau\}$.

Proof. See [A$^+$97]. □

Of course, we have to show that this construction preserves the property of (resp. full) dynamism. However, the non-hiding composition will turn out to be a particular instance of another construction, called the *external composition*, which will be introduced later. Thus, all the propositions for the non-hiding composition shall be established there.

3.4.3 Standard Composition

In the literature, the notion of non-hiding composition is rather called the *parallel composition* and merely a preliminary concept for the following *"standard"* composition:

Definition 3.4.6 (Standard composition [AJ94])**.** Given strategies $\sigma : A \multimap B$ and $\tau : B \multimap C$, where A, B, C are explicit, we define their **standard composition** $\sigma; \tau$ to be the following set of sequences in A, C:

$$\sigma; \tau \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \{s \upharpoonright A, C \mid s \in \sigma \ddagger \tau\}$$

Thus, the standard composition can be phrased as "parallel composition plus hiding". Of course, we need to establish the following fact:

Proposition 3.4.7 (Well-defined standard composition)**.** For (resp. fully) dynamic strategies $\sigma : A \multimap B$ and $\tau : B \multimap C$, where A, B, C are explicit, their standard composition $\sigma; \tau$ forms a well-defined (resp. fully) dynamic strategy on the game $A \multimap C$.

Proof. Again, it suffices to show the preservation property of the standard composition with respect to the axioms (DS3) and (FDS3). However, since $\sigma; \tau : A \multimap C$ with A, C external, they are both equivalent to (S2); so we are done. □

3.4.4 External Composition

We now define a new kind of composition, called *external composition*, which will be the "horizontal composition" on 1-cells in the bicategory of dynamic games and strategies introduced later.

Importantly, it is a generalization of the non-hiding composition, as mentioned previously.

Definition 3.4.8 (External composition)**.** Let $\sigma : J$ and $\sigma' : K$ be dynamic strategies, and assume $\mathcal{H}(J) = A \multimap B$ and $\mathcal{H}(K) = B \multimap C$ for some explicit games A, B, C. We define their **external composition** $\sigma \natural \sigma'$ by

$$\sigma \natural \sigma' \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \{s \in M^*_{J \triangleright K} \mid s \upharpoonright J \in \sigma, s \upharpoonright K \in \sigma', s \upharpoonright B_1, B_2 \in \mathrm{pr}_B\}$$

It is immediate that:

Proposition 3.4.9 (Non-hiding as external composition)**.** Let $\sigma : A \multimap B$ and $\tau : B \multimap C$ be dynamic strategies, where A, B, C are explicit games. Then,

$$\sigma \natural \tau = \sigma \ddagger \tau$$

Proof. With Proposition 2.4.26, it is immediate from the definition. □

Then, as expected, we have:

Proposition 3.4.10 (Well-defined external composition)**.** For (resp. fully) dynamic strategies $\sigma : J$, $\sigma' : K$ with $\mathcal{H}^\omega(J) = A \multimap B$, $\mathcal{H}^\omega(K) = B \multimap C$, where A, B, C are explicit, their external composition $\sigma \natural \sigma'$ is a well-defined (resp. fully) dynamic strategy on the external interaction $J \triangleright K$.

Proof. First, $\sigma \natural \sigma' \subseteq P_{J \triangleright K}$ because, for any $s \in \sigma \natural \sigma'$, we have $s \in M^*_{J \triangleright K}$, $s \upharpoonright J \in \sigma \subseteq P_J$, $s \upharpoonright K \in \sigma' \subseteq P_K$ and $s \upharpoonright B_1, B_2 \in \mathrm{pr}_B$. It is also clear that every $s \in \sigma \natural \sigma'$ is of even-length. We next verify the axioms (S1) and (S2). For this, we need the following:

($\diamondsuit$) Every $t \in \sigma \natural \sigma'$ consists of adjacent pairs x, y with $x, y \in M_J$ or $x, y \in M_K$.

Proof of the claim ($\diamondsuit$). By induction on the length of t. The base case is trivial. Let $txy \in \sigma \natural \sigma'$. If $x \in M_J$, then $(t \upharpoonright J).x.(y \upharpoonright J) \in \sigma$, where $t \upharpoonright J$ is of even-length by the induction hypothesis. Hence, we must have $y \in M_J$. If $x \in M_K$, then by the same argument, we may conclude that $y \in M_K$, establishing the claim ($\diamondsuit$).

Now, we are ready to verify the axioms (S1) and (S2).

- **(S1).** Clearly, $\epsilon \in \sigma \natural \sigma'$, so $\sigma \natural \sigma'$ is non-empty. For the even-prefix-closure, assume $smn \in \sigma \natural \sigma'$. Then by the claim ($\diamondsuit$), we have either $m, n \in M_J$ or $m, n \in M_K$. In either case, it is straightforward to see that $s \in P_{J \triangleright K}$, $s \upharpoonright J \in \sigma$, $s \upharpoonright K \in \sigma'$, and $s \upharpoonright B_1, B_2 \in \mathrm{pr}_B$, i.e., $s \in \sigma \natural \sigma'$.

- **(S2).** Assume $smn, smn' \in \sigma \natural \sigma'$. Again, by the claim ($\diamondsuit$), we have either $m, n, n' \in M_J$ or $m, n, n' \in M_K$. In the former case, we have

  $$(s \upharpoonright J).mn, (s \upharpoonright J).mn' \in \sigma$$

  Thus $n = n'$ and $\mathcal{J}_{smn}(n) = \mathcal{J}_{(s \upharpoonright J).mn}(n) = \mathcal{J}_{(s \upharpoonright J).mn'}(n') = \mathcal{J}_{smn'}(n')$ by (S2) for σ, where note that n, n' are both P-moves and not initial moves in J. In the latter case, we have the same conclusion by (S2) for σ'.

Finally, the axiom (DS3) (resp. (FDS3)) automatically holds, as established in Proposition 3.1.4 and Proposition 2.4.27 (resp. Proposition 2.6.4). □

3.4.5 Tensor Product

We have already defined the tensor product on games. We now define the tensor product on strategies, which is defined to be the "disjoint union of the strategies without interaction".

Definition 3.4.11 (Tensor product on strategies [AJ94])**.** Given dynamic strategies $\sigma : A \multimap C$ and $\tau : B \multimap D$, their **tensor product** $\sigma \otimes \tau$ is defined to be

$$\sigma \otimes \tau \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \{s \in L \mid s \restriction A, C \in \sigma, s \restriction B, D \in \tau\}$$

where $L \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} L_{A \otimes B \multimap C \otimes D}$.

Moreover, if σ and τ are both fully dynamic, then we define their **fully dynamic tensor product** $\sigma \boxtimes \tau$ by

$$\sigma \boxtimes \tau \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \{s \in L' \mid s \restriction A, C \in \sigma, s \restriction B, D \in \tau\}$$

where $L' \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} L_{A \boxtimes B \multimap C \boxtimes D}$.

Again, we need to establish:

Proposition 3.4.12 (Well-defined tensor product on strategies)**.** Given (resp. fully) dynamic strategies $\sigma : A \multimap C$ and $\tau : B \multimap D$, their (resp. fully) tensor product $\sigma \otimes \tau$ (resp. $\sigma \boxtimes \tau$) forms a well-defined (resp. fully) dynamic strategy on the game $A \otimes B \multimap C \otimes D$ (resp. $A \boxtimes B \multimap C \boxtimes D$).

Proof. Again, the tensor product $\sigma \otimes \tau$ is automatically (resp. fully) dynamic by Proposition 3.1.4. □

3.4.6 Paring

We now proceed to define the construction of *paring*.

Definition 3.4.13 (Paring of strategies [AJM00, McC98])**.** Given dynamic strategies with the same domain $\sigma : C \multimap A$ and $\tau : C \multimap B$, we define their **paring** $\langle \sigma, \tau \rangle$ by

$$\langle \sigma, \tau \rangle \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \{s \in L \mid s \restriction C, A \in \sigma, s \restriction B = \epsilon\} \cup \{s \in L \mid s \restriction C, B \in \tau, s \restriction A = \epsilon\}$$

where $L \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} L_{C \multimap A \& B}$.

As expected, we have:

Proposition 3.4.14 (Well-defined paring)**.** Given (resp. fully) dynamic strategies $\sigma : C \multimap A$ and $\tau : C \multimap B$, their paring $\langle \sigma, \tau \rangle$ forms a well-defined (resp. fully) dynamic strategy on the game $C \multimap A \& B$.

Proof. Again by Proposition 3.1.4. □

We now define a generalization of the paring:

Definition 3.4.15 (Generalized paring)**.** Let $\sigma : J, \tau : K$ be dynamic strategies, where $\mathcal{H}^\omega(J) = C \multimap A$, $\mathcal{H}^\omega(K) = C \multimap B$. Then we define the **generalized paring** $\langle \sigma, \tau \rangle$ of σ and τ to be

$$\langle \sigma, \tau \rangle \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \{ s \in L \mid s \restriction C, J \in \sigma, s \restriction B = \epsilon \} \cup \{ s \in L \mid s \restriction C, K \in \tau, s \restriction A = \epsilon \}$$

where $L \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} L_{J \&^C K}$.

Clearly, the notion of the generalized paring is a generalization of the usual paring. We often call a generalized paring just paring. Then, it is completely analogous to establish:

Proposition 3.4.16 (Well-defined generalized paring)**.** For any (resp. fully) dynamic strategies $\sigma : J$, $\tau : K$, where $\mathcal{H}^\omega(J) = C \multimap A$, $\mathcal{H}^\omega(K) = C \multimap B$, their generalized paring $\langle \sigma, \tau \rangle$ forms a well-defined (resp. fully) dynamic strategy on the game $J \&^C K$.

Proof. Similar to the proof for the usual paring. □

3.4.7 Promotion

Next, we define a construction which is fundamental when we equip a category of games and strategies with a cartesian closed structure:

Definition 3.4.17 (Promotion [AJM00, McC98])**.** Given a strategy $\sigma : !A \multimap B$, we define its **promotion** $\sigma^\dagger$ by

$$\sigma^\dagger \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \{ s \in L_{!A \multimap !B} \mid s \restriction m \in \sigma \text{ for all initial occurrences } m \}$$

Intuitively, the promotion $\sigma^\dagger$ is the strategy which plays as σ for each thread. As expected, we have the following:

Proposition 3.4.18 (Well-defined promotion)**.** For a (resp. fully) dynamic strategy $\sigma : !A \multimap B$, its promotion $\sigma^\dagger$ forms a well-defined (resp. fully) dynamic strategy on the game $!A \multimap !B$.

Proof. The preservation of dynamism (DS3) is just by Proposition 3.1.4. It remains to establish the preservation of full dynamism (FDS3) under promotion. Let $i \in \mathbb{N}$, and assume $smn, s'm'n' \in \sigma^\dagger$ with n, n' external or j-internal with $j > i$, and $\mathcal{H}^i(sm) = \mathcal{H}^i(s'm')$. Let q be the occurrence of an initial move that starts the thread to which n belongs. Note that, by Proposition 2.4.23, n' also belongs to the thread of q because $sm, s'm'$ are both i-complete and so $\mathcal{H}^i(s).m = \mathcal{H}^i(s').m'$ (in particular m, m' belong to the same thread). We then have $(sm \restriction q).n, (s'm' \restriction q).n' \in \sigma$. Also,

$$\mathcal{H}^i_{!A \multimap B}(sm \restriction q) = \mathcal{H}^i_{!A \multimap !B}(sm) \restriction q = \mathcal{H}^i_{!A \multimap !B}(s'm') \restriction q = \mathcal{H}^i_{!A \multimap B}(s'm' \restriction q)$$

Hence by (FDS3) for σ, we have $n = n'$, and

$$\mathcal{J}^{\ominus i}_{smn}(n) = \mathcal{J}^{\ominus i}_{(sm \restriction q).n}(n) = \mathcal{J}^{\ominus i}_{(s'm' \restriction q).n'}(n') = \mathcal{J}^{\ominus i}_{s'm'n'}(n')$$

□

We also have a lemma, which will be used later:

Lemma 3.4.19 (Promotion in composition [AJM00, McC98])**.** Let $\sigma : !A \multimap B$ and $\tau : !B \multimap C$ be strategies. Then we have

$$(\sigma^\dagger ; \tau)^\dagger = \sigma^\dagger ; \tau^\dagger : !A \multimap !C$$

Proof. See [McC98]. □

We proceed to establish an important lemma.

Lemma 3.4.20 (Exponential and promotion)**.** If $\sigma : G$, where G is a well-opened and explicit game, then we have

$$\overline{\sigma^\dagger} = !\overline{\sigma} \leqslant !G$$

Proof. By the definition, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
!\overline{\sigma} &= !(\sigma \cup \{ta \mid t \in \sigma, ta \in P_G\}) \\
&= \{s \in L_{!G} \mid \text{for all initial } m, (s \upharpoonright m \in \sigma) \vee (s \upharpoonright m = ta \text{ with } t \in \sigma \wedge ta \in P_G)\} \\
&= \{s \in L_{!G} \mid s \upharpoonright m \in \sigma \text{ for all initial } m\} \\
&\quad \cup \{sa \in L_{!G} \mid s \upharpoonright m \in \sigma \text{ for all initial } m, (s \upharpoonright n).a \in P_G \text{ for a unique initial } n\} \\
&= \sigma^\dagger \cup \{sa \mid s \in \sigma^\dagger, sa \in P_{!G}\} \\
&= \overline{\sigma^\dagger}
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, the subgame relation $!\overline{\sigma} \leqslant !G$ is immediate by Proposition 3.1.6 and Proposition 2.5.6.

□

3.4.8 Dereliction

If the exponential ! were a comonad (in the form of a co-Kleisli triple), then there would be a strategy

$$\mathrm{der}_A : !A \multimap A$$

called the *dereliction* on A, satisfying $\mathrm{der}_A^\dagger = \mathrm{id}_{!A}$ and $\sigma^\dagger ; \mathrm{der}_A = \sigma$, for any games A, B and strategy $\sigma : !A \multimap B$.

It appears that we may take the copy-cat strategy on A as der_A; however, it does not work for an arbitrary game A, as described in [McC98]. In fact, we have to require games to be *well-opened*:

Definition 3.4.21 (Well-opened games)**.** A game G is **well-opened** if and only if for all $sm \in P_G$, if m is initial, then $s = \epsilon$.

That is, a game is well-opened iff it consists only of single-threaded plays. Observe that:

- If B is a well-opened game, then so is the linear implication $A \multimap B$ for any game A.

- We shall construct a cartesian closed bicategory, in which all games are well-opened, and exponentials are given by $A \to B \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} !A^h \multimap B$; so exponentials are again well-opened.

Also, note that even if a game A is well-opened, its exponential $!A$ is not. However, in the cartesian closed bicategory, which we shall obtain by taking the co-Kleisli category with respect to the exponential co-Kleisli triple, the exponential ! is not an allowed construction; thus the games will be always well-opened.

Now we are ready to define derelictions:

Definition 3.4.22 (Derelicitions [AJM00, McC98])**.** Let A be a well-opened and explicit game. Then we define a strategy

$$\mathrm{der}_A : !A \multimap A$$

called the **dereliction** on A, as the copy-cat strategy on A.

Then we have:

Proposition 3.4.23 (Well-defined derelictions [AJM00, McC98])**.** For any well-opened and explicit game A, the copy-cat strategy on A can be seen as a well-defined strategy on the game $!A \multimap A$.

Proof. The point is that because A is well-opened, the resulting play must be essentially the same as the copy-cat strategy on A; for the detail, see [McC98]. Here, we just note that since the dereliction der_A is on an explicit game $!A \multimap A$, it is trivially fully dynamic. □

Also, we have the following proposition, which provides a useful intuition:

Lemma 3.4.24 (Derelictions in the functional form [McC98])**.** The view function of the dereliction der_A on a well-opened and explicit game A coincides with that of the copy-cat strategy cp_A as well as that of the copy-cat strategy $\mathrm{cp}_{!A}$.

Proof. See [McC98]. □

Finally, we record a basic property of derelictions:

Proposition 3.4.25 (Composing derelictions [McC98])**.** Let $\sigma : !A \multimap B$ be a strategy, where B is well-opened. Then we have:

$$\mathrm{der}_B^\dagger = \mathrm{cp}_{!B}$$
$$\sigma^\dagger ; \mathrm{der}_B = \sigma$$

Proof. See [McC98]. □

3.4.9 Parallel Product

In this section, we introduce another new construction on strategies, called *parallel product*. It will be the horizontal composition on 2-cells in the bicategory of dynamic games and strategies, which will be introduced later.

We first need the following definition:

Definition 3.4.26 (Square-forming strategies)**.** Let σ, τ be strategies with $\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma), \mathcal{H}^\omega(\tau) : A \multimap B$, where A, B are explicit and well-opened. Then, a strategy α with $\mathcal{H}^\omega(\alpha) : \overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma)} \multimap \overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\tau)}$ is said to be **square-forming**, if, for any $smn \in \mathcal{H}^\omega(\alpha)$, m and n have the same "AB-parity" but the different "$\sigma\tau$-parity", i.e., m is an A-move (resp. a B-move) iff so is n, and m is a σ-move (resp. a τ-move) iff n is a τ-move (resp. σ-move).

The term "square-forming" comes from the diagram in Table 4, where the transition of the external moves of α draws a square. A more detailed account of all the possible transitions of the external moves in α is provided by Table 5, in which the state of OP-parity is drawn by a matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} A_\sigma^{\mathrm{OP}} & B_\sigma^{\mathrm{OP}} \\ A_\tau^{\mathrm{OP}} & B_\tau^{\mathrm{OP}} \end{pmatrix}$$

where A_σ^{OP} is the OP-parity of the next possible A_σ-move, and so on. We record this observation as the following proposition:

Proposition 3.4.27 (Square-forming transitions)**.** Let α be a square-forming strategy with $\mathcal{H}^\omega(\alpha) : \overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma)} \multimap \overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\tau)}$, where $\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma), \mathcal{H}^\omega(\tau) : A \multimap B$ and A, B are explicit and well-opened. Then the AB-, $\sigma\tau$-, and OP-parities of any $s \in \mathcal{H}^\omega(\alpha)$ can be represented as an even-length prefix of a sequence in the following set

$$\{B_\tau^{\mathrm{O}} B_\sigma^{\mathrm{P}} (B_\sigma^{\mathrm{O}} B_\tau^{\mathrm{P}} B_\tau^{\mathrm{O}} B_\sigma^{\mathrm{P}})^* (A_\sigma^{\mathrm{O}} A_\tau^{\mathrm{P}} A_\tau^{\mathrm{O}} A_\sigma^{\mathrm{P}})^* B_\sigma^{\mathrm{O}} B_\tau^{\mathrm{P}}\}^*$$

where X_Z^Y denotes an X- (A- or B-) move with OP-parity Y which belongs to the strategy Z (σ or τ).

Proof. Immediate from Table 5. □

We shall consider the operation of parallel product only on square-forming strategies, because they are "well-behaving" with respect to the operation.

Definition 3.4.28 (Parallel product)**.** Assume that there are strategies

$$\sigma : A \multimap B \qquad \sigma' : B \multimap C$$
$$\tau : L \multimap G \qquad \tau' : G \multimap R$$

where A, B, C, L, G, R are all explicit and well-opened games. Then for any square-forming strategies α, α' such that

$$\mathcal{H}(\alpha) : \overline{\sigma} \multimap \overline{\tau}$$
$$\mathcal{H}(\alpha') : \overline{\sigma'} \multimap \overline{\tau'}$$



Table 4: The square-forming diagram

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathrm{P} & \mathrm{O} \\ \mathrm{O} & \mathrm{P} \end{pmatrix} \overset{A_\tau, A_\sigma}{\longleftrightarrow} \begin{pmatrix} \mathrm{O} & \mathrm{O} \\ \mathrm{P} & \mathrm{P} \end{pmatrix} \overset{B_\sigma, B_\tau}{\longleftrightarrow} \begin{pmatrix} \mathrm{O} & \mathrm{P} \\ \mathrm{P} & \mathrm{O} \end{pmatrix}$$

Table 5: The square-forming transition

We define the **parallel product** $\alpha \,|\!|\!\downarrow \alpha'$ of α and α' to be

$$\alpha \,|\!|\!\downarrow \alpha' \overset{\text{df.}}{=} \{ s \downharpoonright B, G \mid s \in \alpha \Downarrow \alpha' \}$$

where $\alpha \Downarrow \alpha'$ is defined to be the set

$$\{ s \in M^* \mid \text{non-}BG\text{-last}\{s\}, s \upharpoonright \alpha \in \alpha, s \upharpoonright \alpha' \in \alpha', s \upharpoonright G \in \mathrm{pr}_G \}$$

M is the set of all the moves involved, and non-BG-last$\{s\}$ means that the last move of s is not B- or G- move.

Intuitively, $\alpha \,|\!|\!\downarrow \alpha'$ is a strategy that plays as α for σ-, τ-moves and as α' for σ'-, τ'-moves, where α and α' communicate with each other through G-moves.

Note that, in the above definition, $\alpha \,|\!|\!\downarrow\, \alpha'$ is not always well-defined; we need to have $s \upharpoonright G \in \mathrm{pr}_G$, but it does not always hold. Thus, we need further restrictions on α and α', and develop the underlying game. However, at the moment, the following result suffices for our purpose:

Proposition 3.4.29 (Parallel product of identities)**.** We have the following equations:

1. Given strategies $\sigma : A \multimap B$, $\sigma' : B \multimap C$, where A, B, C are explicit and well-opened, we have
$$\mathrm{cp}_{\overline{\sigma}} \,|\!|\!\downarrow \mathrm{cp}_{\overline{\sigma'}} = \mathrm{cp}_{\overline{\sigma;\sigma'}}$$
2. Given strategies $\tau : !L \multimap G$, $\tau' : !G \multimap R$, where L, G, R are explicit and well-opened, we have
$$\mathrm{der}^\dagger_{\overline{\tau}} \,|\!|\!\downarrow \mathrm{der}_{\overline{\tau'}} = \mathrm{der}_{\overline{\tau^\dagger;\tau'}}$$

Thus, in particular, these parallel products are well-defined strategies.


$\begin{pmatrix} O & O & P & O \\ P & P & O & P \end{pmatrix}$
$B_{\sigma_1}, B_{\sigma_2}, B_{\sigma'_2}, B_{\sigma'_1}$
$\begin{pmatrix} O & P & O & O \\ P & O & P & P \end{pmatrix}$
A_{σ_1}
A_{σ_2}
$C_{\sigma'_1}$
$C_{\sigma'_2}$
$\begin{pmatrix} P & O & P & O \\ O & P & O & P \end{pmatrix}$
$\begin{pmatrix} O & P & O & P \\ P & O & P & O \end{pmatrix}$

Table 6: The double square-forming transition

Proof. We show only the clause 1; the clause 2 is completely analogous. First, it is straightforward to see, by Proposition 3.4.27, that the "parity diagram" for the moves in $\alpha \mathbin{!|!} \alpha'$ is exactly what Table 6 shows, in which a matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} A^{\mathrm{OP}}_{\sigma_1} & B^{\mathrm{OP}}_{\sigma_1} & B^{\mathrm{OP}}_{\sigma'_1} & C^{\mathrm{OP}}_{\sigma'_1} \\ A^{\mathrm{OP}}_{\sigma_2} & B^{\mathrm{OP}}_{\sigma_2} & B^{\mathrm{OP}}_{\sigma'_2} & C^{\mathrm{OP}}_{\sigma'_2} \end{pmatrix}$$

indicates that the next possible A_{σ_1}-move has the OP-parity $A^{\mathrm{OP}}_{\sigma_1}$, and so on, in which we put the subscripts $1, 2$ to distinguish two copies of σ, σ', respectively. This diagram directly establishes the first equation, which also implies that the resulting parallel product is a well-defined strategy on the game $\overline{\sigma; \sigma'}$.

□

Importantly, it may happen that the σ-part of α and the σ'-part of α' do not match, i.e., they do not form a valid position of the game $\overline{\sigma; \sigma'}$ and the corresponding responses are undefined. This problem has been resolved only when we restrict ourselves only to copy-cat strategies and derelictions. However, we conjecture that we may relax this condition:

Conjecture 3.4.30. We have the following:

1. Given strategies $\alpha \approx \mathrm{cp}_{\overline{\sigma}}$, $\alpha' \approx \mathrm{cp}_{\overline{\sigma'}}$, where $\sigma : A \multimap B$, $\sigma' : B \multimap C$, and A, B, C are explicit and well-opened, we have
$$\alpha \mathbin{!|!} \alpha' \approx \mathrm{cp}_{\overline{\sigma;\sigma'}}$$
2. Given strategies $\beta \approx \mathrm{der}_{\overline{\tau}}$, $\beta' \approx \mathrm{der}_{\overline{\tau'}}$, where $\tau : !L \multimap G$, $\tau' : !G \multimap R$, and L, G, R are explicit and well-opened, we have
$$\beta \mathbin{!|!} \beta' \approx \mathrm{der}_{\overline{\tau;\tau'}}$$

Moreover, these parallel products are well-defined strategies on some games.

It is a future work to establish it (in the current setting of dynamic games and strategies, it turns out to be impossible).

3.4.10 Notation

Similar to the constructions on games, it is often convenient to have a notation for an arbitrary construction on strategies: We write I for a finite "index set" and use the symbol $\spadesuit$ for an arbitrary construction. Then, the result of applying the construction $\spadesuit$ for strategies $\sigma_i, i \in I$, is denoted by

$$\spadesuit_{i \in I} \sigma_i$$

3.5 Homomorphism Theorem for Hiding on Strategies

In this section, we shall establish the homomorphism theorem for the hiding operation on strategies. However, equality will hold only for the constructions relevant to the cartesian closed structure (which will be introduced later): composition, paring, promotion and parallel product.

We first need the following lemma:

Lemma 3.5.1 (Threads in exponential)**.** Let G be a game, and $s \in P_{!G}$. Then for any initial occurrence m, we have

1. If s ends with an external move, then so does $s \upharpoonright m$;
2. If $s \upharpoonright m$ ends with an internal move, say $s \upharpoonright m = tnx_1 \dots x_k$, where n is external, $k > 0$, and x_i, $i = 1, \dots, k$, are internal, then $s = unx_1 \dots x_k$ with $u \upharpoonright m = t$.

Proof. First, by Proposition 2.4.23, s consists of single-threaded segments of even-length, except for the last segment. Thus, we have

(♯) Each non-last segment begins and ends with an external move.

Therefore we may conclude that:

- The clause 1 immediately follows from the claim (♯).
- Assume $s \upharpoonright m = tnx_1 \dots x_k$, where n is external, $k > 0$, and x_i, $i = 1, \dots, k$, are internal. By the claim (♯), the sequence $nx_1 \dots x_k$ must belong to the last segment of s, establishing the clause 2.

□

Now we prove the homomorphism theorem:

Theorem 3.5.2 (Homomorphism theorem for hiding on strategies)**.** Let I be a finite "index set" and $\spadesuit$ a construction on strategies, which is either standard composition, (generalized) paring, promotion or parallel product. Then for any dynamic strategies σ_i, $i \in I$, we have:

1. $\mathcal{H}^\omega(\spadesuit_{i \in I} \sigma_i) = \spadesuit_{i \in I} \mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma_i)$;
2. $\mathcal{H}^d(\spadesuit_{i \in I} \sigma_i) = \spadesuit_{i \in I} \mathcal{H}^d(\sigma_i)$ for all $d \in \mathbb{N}$, if the strategies σ_i, $i \in I$, are all fully dynamic.

Proof. We shall establish only the "finer" equation 2; it is analogous to show the "coarser" equation 1. By Proposition 3.2.9, it suffices to focus on the case $d = 1$.

Standard composition. Since the standard compositions is defined only on explicit strategies, the equation is rather trivial: For any strategies $\sigma : A \multimap B$, $B \multimap C$, where A, B, C are explicit, we have

$$\mathcal{H}(\sigma; \tau) = \sigma; \tau = \mathcal{H}(\sigma); \mathcal{H}(\tau)$$

Generalized paring. Let $\sigma_1 : J$, $\sigma_2 : K$ be strategies with $\mathcal{H}^\omega(J) = C \multimap A_1$, $\mathcal{H}^\omega(K) = C \multimap A_2$. We first show $\mathcal{H}(\langle \sigma_1, \sigma_2 \rangle) \leqslant \langle \mathcal{H}(\sigma_1), \mathcal{H}(\sigma_2) \rangle$. Assume $s \in \mathcal{H}(\langle \sigma_1, \sigma_2 \rangle)$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\exists t \in \langle \sigma_1, \sigma_2 \rangle.\, t \upharpoonright \mathcal{H} = s \\
\Rightarrow\ & t \in L \wedge t \upharpoonright \mathcal{H} = s \wedge \{(t \upharpoonright C, J \in \sigma_1 \wedge t \upharpoonright A_2 = \epsilon) \vee (t \upharpoonright C, K \in \sigma_2 \wedge t \upharpoonright A_1 = \epsilon)\} \\
\Rightarrow\ & s \in L^h \wedge (s \upharpoonright C, J^h \in \mathcal{H}(\sigma_1) \wedge s \upharpoonright A_2 = \epsilon) \vee (s \upharpoonright C, K^h \in \mathcal{H}(\sigma_2) \wedge s \upharpoonright A_1 = \epsilon) \\
\Rightarrow\ & t \in \langle \mathcal{H}(\sigma_1), \mathcal{H}(\sigma_2) \rangle
\end{aligned}$$

where L, L^h are the sets of the legal positions of the games $J \&^C K$, $C \multimap A_1 \& A_2$, respectively. Next, we show the converse. Let $s \in \langle \mathcal{H}(\sigma_1), \mathcal{H}(\sigma_2) \rangle$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
& s \in L^h \wedge \{(s \upharpoonright C, J^h \in \mathcal{H}(\sigma_1) \wedge s \upharpoonright A_2 = \epsilon) \vee (s \upharpoonright C, K^h \in \mathcal{H}(\sigma_2) \wedge s \upharpoonright A_1 = \epsilon)\} \\
\Rightarrow\ & (\exists u \in \sigma_1.\, u \upharpoonright \mathcal{H} = s \upharpoonright C, J^h \wedge s \upharpoonright A_2 = \epsilon) \vee (\exists v \in \sigma_2.\, v \upharpoonright \mathcal{H} = s \upharpoonright C, K^h \wedge s \upharpoonright A_1 = \epsilon) \\
\Rightarrow\ & \exists w \in \langle \sigma_1, \sigma_2 \rangle.\, w \upharpoonright \mathcal{H} = s \\
\Rightarrow\ & s \in \mathcal{H}(\langle \sigma_1, \sigma_2 \rangle)
\end{aligned}$$

Promotion. Let $\psi : J$ be a strategy, where $\mathcal{H}^\omega(J) = !A \multimap B$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{H}(\psi^\dagger) &= \{ s \upharpoonright \mathcal{H} \mid s \in \psi^\dagger \} \\
&= \{ s \upharpoonright \mathcal{H} \mid s \in L_J, s \upharpoonright m \in \psi \text{ for all initial } m \} \\
&\subseteq \{ s \upharpoonright \mathcal{H} \mid s \in L_J, (s \upharpoonright m) \upharpoonright \mathcal{H} \in \mathcal{H}(\psi) \text{ for all initial } m \} \\
&= \{ s \upharpoonright \mathcal{H} \mid s \in L_J, (s \upharpoonright \mathcal{H}) \upharpoonright m \in \mathcal{H}(\psi) \text{ for all initial } m \} \\
&= \{ t \in L_{J^h} \mid t \upharpoonright m \in \mathcal{H}(\psi) \text{ for all initial } m \} \text{ (by Lemma 3.2.10)} \\
&= \mathcal{H}(\psi)^\dagger
\end{aligned}$$

For the opposite inclusion, let $s \in \mathcal{H}(\psi)^\dagger$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{for all initial } m, s \in L_{J^h}, s \upharpoonright m \in \mathcal{H}(\psi) \\
\Rightarrow\ & \text{for all initial } m, \exists t_m \in \psi.\, t_m \upharpoonright \mathcal{H} = s \upharpoonright m \\
\Rightarrow\ & \exists u \in \psi^\dagger.\, u \upharpoonright \mathcal{H} = s \\
\Rightarrow\ & s \in \mathcal{H}(\psi^\dagger)
\end{aligned}$$

Parallel composition. It is clear as we consider only the parallel composition of the explicit strategies which are dealt with in Lemma 3.4.29. □

We now investigate the result of hiding external composition:

Proposition 3.5.3 (Hiding external composition)**.** Let $\sigma : J$, $\tau : K$ be strategies, and assume $\mathcal{H}^\omega(J) = A \multimap B$ and $\mathcal{H}^\omega(K) = B \multimap C$. Then we have:

1. $\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma \natural \tau) = \mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma); \mathcal{H}^\omega(\tau)$
2. If both σ and τ are both in normal form, then
$$\mathcal{H}(\sigma \natural \tau) = \mathcal{H}(\sigma); \mathcal{H}(\tau) = \sigma; \tau$$
3. If either σ or τ is not in normal form but both are fully dynamic, then
$$\mathcal{H}(\sigma \natural \tau) = \mathcal{H}(\sigma) \natural \mathcal{H}(\tau)$$

Proof. We show only the equation 3; the equation 2 is immediate from the definition, and the equation 1 is derived from the equations 2, 3. By Lemma 3.2.8, it suffices to show $\mathcal{H}((\sigma \natural \tau)^1_\downarrow) = \mathcal{H}(\sigma^1_\downarrow) \natural \mathcal{H}(\tau^1_\downarrow)$. For the inclusion $\mathcal{H}((\sigma \natural \tau)^1_\downarrow) \subseteq \mathcal{H}(\sigma^1_\downarrow) \natural \mathcal{H}(\tau^1_\downarrow)$, let $s \in \mathcal{H}((\sigma \natural \tau)^1_\downarrow)$. Then we have $\exists t \in (\sigma \natural \tau)^1_\downarrow . t \restriction \mathcal{H} = s$; thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\exists t \in M^* . t \restriction J \in \sigma^1_\downarrow \wedge t \restriction K \in \tau^1_\downarrow \wedge t \restriction B_1, B_2 \in \mathrm{pr}_B \wedge t \restriction \mathcal{H} = s \\
\Rightarrow\ &\exists t \in M^* . \mathcal{H}(t \restriction J) \in \mathcal{H}(\sigma^1_\downarrow) \wedge \mathcal{H}(t \restriction K) \in \mathcal{H}(\tau^1_\downarrow) \wedge \mathcal{H}(t \restriction B_1, B_2) \in \mathrm{pr}_B \\
&\wedge \mathcal{H}(t) = s \\
\Rightarrow\ &\mathcal{H}(t) \in \widehat{M^*} . \mathcal{H}(t) \restriction J^h \in \mathcal{H}(\sigma^1_\downarrow) \wedge \mathcal{H}(t) \restriction K^h \in \mathcal{H}(\tau^1_\downarrow) \\
&\wedge \mathcal{H}(t) \restriction B_1, B_2 \in \mathrm{pr}_B \wedge \mathcal{H}(t) = s \\
\Rightarrow\ &s \in \widehat{M^*} . s \restriction J^h \in \mathcal{H}(\sigma^1_\downarrow) \wedge s \restriction K^h \in \mathcal{H}(\tau^1_\downarrow) \wedge s \restriction B_1, B_2 \in \mathrm{pr}_B \\
\Rightarrow\ &s \in \mathcal{H}(\sigma^1_\downarrow) \natural \mathcal{H}(\tau^1_\downarrow)
\end{aligned}$$

where $M \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} M_{J \triangleright K}$, $\widehat{M} \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} M_{(J \triangleright K)^h}$.

For the converse inclusion, let $s \in \mathcal{H}(\sigma^1_\downarrow) \natural \mathcal{H}(\tau^1_\downarrow)$; then,

$$\begin{aligned}
&s \in \widehat{M^*} . s \restriction J^h \in \mathcal{H}(\sigma^1_\downarrow) \wedge s \restriction K^h \in \mathcal{H}(\tau^1_\downarrow) \wedge s \restriction B_1, B_2 \in \mathrm{pr}_B \\
\Rightarrow\ &s \in \widehat{M^*} . \exists u \in \sigma^1_\downarrow . \mathcal{H}(u) = s \restriction J^h \wedge \exists v \in \tau^1_\downarrow . \mathcal{H}(v) = s \restriction K^h \\
&\wedge s \restriction B_1, B_2 \in \mathrm{pr}_B \\
\Rightarrow\ &\exists w \in \sigma^1_\downarrow \natural \tau^1_\downarrow . \mathcal{H}(w) = s \\
\Rightarrow\ &s \in \mathcal{H}(\sigma^1_\downarrow \natural \tau^1_\downarrow)
\end{aligned}$$

□

4 Categorical Structures

In this section, we analyze the categorical structure of the universe of (resp. fully) dynamic games and strategies.

Since internal moves are essential part of dynamic strategies, the composition of our category must be the *"non-hiding"* one. However, it will not give rise to a (strict) category, because it cannot have (strict) identities (though the composition would be strictly associative, modulo the "tags" for disjoint union).

As a natural idea, we may take, rather than the strict equality, the external equality $\approx$ as a main notion of equality between strategies. Then, however, we would lose the structure of internal moves and the resulting category would be essentially the existing category of HO-games.

The point is that we have to keep the structure of internal moves but set the external equality as the equality between strategies. As a solution, we implement this idea as a *bicategory*, where the existence of a 2-cell between two 1-cells corresponds to the external equality between these 1-cells. As expected, it will be equipped with a cartesian closed structure, forming a *cartesian closed bicategory*.

Of course, we may generalize this idea and develop the tricategory, quadcategory, and so on. However, since our main aim here is to rephrase the external equality in terms of the existence of 2-cells, the bicategory should be an appropriate structure.

4.1 Bicategory of Dynamic Games and Strategies

First, to fix a notation, we just briefly recall the notion of a *bicategory*, where we mainly use a notation of "right-pointing" compositions rather than the more standard "left-pointing" ones (i.e., ";" rather than "$\circ$"). Also, we adopt some terminologies, which may not be standard.

Definition 4.1.1 (Bicategories [Bor94])**.** A **bicategory** $\mathcal{B}$ consists of the following data:

- A class $|\mathcal{B}|$ of **objects** (or **0-cells**). We usually write objects by A, B, C, etc. and $A \in \mathcal{B}$ to mean that A is an object of $\mathcal{B}$.
- For each pair $A, B \in \mathcal{B}$ of objects, a small category $\mathcal{B}(A, B)$, whose objects are called **arrows** (or **1-cells**), and morphisms are called **2-cells**. We usually write $f, g : A \to B$ and $\alpha : f \Rightarrow g$ to mean $f, g \in \mathcal{B}(A, B)$ and $\alpha \in \mathcal{B}(A, B)(f, g)$, respectively. The composition is called the **vertical composition**, and it is written $\alpha \ddagger \beta$ (or $\beta \odot \alpha$), where $f, g, h : A \to B$ and $f \overset{\alpha}{\Rightarrow} g \overset{\beta}{\Rightarrow} h$. The identity id_f on each 1-cell f is called the **vertical identity** on f.

- For each triple $A, B, C \in \mathcal{B}$ of objects, a bifunctor

$$\begin{aligned} c_{A,B,C} : \mathcal{B}(A,B) \times \mathcal{B}(B,C) &\to \mathcal{B}(A,C) \\ (f,g) &\mapsto f;g \text{ (or written } g \circ f) \\ (\alpha,\alpha') &\mapsto \alpha \parallel \alpha' \text{ (or written } \alpha' * \alpha) \end{aligned}$$

  called the **horizontal composition**.

- For each object $A \in \mathcal{B}$, a functor

$$u_A : 1 \to \mathcal{B}(A,A)$$

  where 1 is the terminal category of just one object $\cdot$ and the identity on it. We write id_A for the 1-cell $u_A(\cdot) : A \to A$ and call it the **horizontal pre-identiy** on A. Also, we usually write i_A, rather than $\mathrm{id}_{\mathrm{id}_A}$ for the 2-cell $u_A(\mathrm{id}_\cdot) : \mathrm{id}_A \to \mathrm{id}_A$.

- For each quadruple $A, B, C, D \in \mathcal{B}$ of objects, a natural isomorphism

$$\alpha^{A,B,C,D} : (c_{A,B,C} \times \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{B}(C,D)}); c_{A,C,D} \overset{\cong}{\Rightarrow} (j; (\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{B}(A,B)} \times c_{B,C,D})); c_{A,B,D}$$

  called the **associativity isomorphism**, where

$$j : (\mathcal{B}(A,B) \times \mathcal{B}(B,C)) \times \mathcal{B}(C,D) \overset{\cong}{\to} \mathcal{B}(A,B) \times (\mathcal{B}(B,C) \times \mathcal{B}(C,D))$$

  is the canonical isomorphism functor.

- For each pair $A, B \in \mathcal{B}$ of objects, two natural isomorphisms

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda^{A,B} &: \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{B}(A,B)} \overset{\cong}{\Rightarrow} (j_1; (u_A \times \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{B}(A,B)})); c_{A,A,B} \\ \rho^{A,B} &: \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{B}(A,B)} \overset{\cong}{\Rightarrow} (j_2; (\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{B}(A,B)} \times u_B)); c_{A,B,B} \end{aligned}$$

  called the **unit isomorphisms**, where

$$\begin{aligned} j_1 &: \mathcal{B}(A,B) \overset{\cong}{\to} 1 \times \mathcal{B}(A,B) \\ j_2 &: \mathcal{B}(A,B) \overset{\cong}{\to} \mathcal{B}(A,B) \times 1 \end{aligned}$$

  are the canonical isomorphism functors.

These natural isomorphisms are required to satisfy the following coherence conditions:

- **Associativity coherence.** Given 1-cells $A \overset{f}{\to} B \overset{g}{\to} C \overset{h}{\to} D \overset{k}{\to} E$, the following equality between 2-cells in $\mathcal{B}(A,E)$ holds

$$(\alpha^{A,B,C,D}_{f,g,h} \parallel \mathrm{id}_k) \ddagger \alpha^{A,B,D,E}_{f,g;h,k} \ddagger (\mathrm{id}_f \parallel \alpha^{B,C,D,E}_{g,h,k}) = \alpha^{A,C,D,E}_{f;g,h,k} \ddagger \alpha^{A,B,C,E}_{f,g,h;k}$$

- **Unit coherence.** Given 1-cells $A \xrightarrow{f} B \xrightarrow{g} C$, the following equation between 2-cells in $\mathcal{B}(A, B)$ holds

$$(\rho_f^{A,B} \parallel \mathrm{id}_g); \alpha_{f,\mathrm{id}_B,g}^{A,B,B,C} = \mathrm{id}_f \parallel \lambda_g^{A,B}$$

Intuitively, a bicategory is a generalization of a category, in which the associativity and unit laws are relaxed "up to natural isomorphisms". The coherence conditions ensures that the effect of such natural isomorphisms is invariant with respect to the choices available thereof.

Now, we define the bicategory of dynamic games and strategies. We take well-opened dynamic games as 0-cells, which ensures that strategies can be seen as games (see Proposition 3.1.6). Also, as long as "types" of strategies are concerned, we just focus on the external behavior; so we require that 0-cells are explicit.

Definition 4.1.2 (The bicategory $\mathcal{D}$ of dynamic games and strategies)**.** The bicategory $\mathcal{D}$ of dynamic games and strategies is defined as follows:

- **0-cells.** 0-cells are well-opened and explicit, dynamic games.
- **1-cells.** A 1-cell $\sigma : A \to B$ is a dynamic strategy σ that satisfies

$$\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma) : A \multimap B$$

- **2-cells.** A 2-cell $\alpha : \sigma \Rightarrow \tau$ is the copy-cat strategy

$$\mathrm{cp}_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma)}} = \mathrm{cp}_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\tau)}} : \overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma)} \multimap \overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\tau)}$$

  if $\sigma \approx \tau$ (otherwise, there is no 2-cell between σ and τ).

- **Vertical composition.** The "vertical" composition on 2-cells is the standard (i.e., with hiding) composition ";" of strategies.
- **Vertical identity.** The identity id_σ on each 1-cell σ with respect to the vertical composition is defined to be the copy-cat strategy

$$\mathrm{cp}_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma)}} : \overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma)} \multimap \overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma)}$$

- **Horizontal compositions.** The "horizontal" composition on 1-cells is the external composition "$\natural$", and the one on 2-cells is the parallel product "$\downdownarrows$".
- **Horizontal pre-identity.** The "pre"-identity id_A on each 0-cell A with respect to the horizontal composition on 1-cells is the copy-cat strategy $\mathrm{cp}_A : A \multimap A$.
- **Natural isomorphisms.** For each quadruple A, B, C, D of 0-cells, the natural isomorphisms

– $\alpha^{A,B,C,D} : (c_{A,B,C} \times \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{D}(C,D)}); c_{A,C,D} \overset{\cong}{\Rightarrow} (j; (\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{D}(A,B)} \times c_{B,C,D})); c_{A,B,D}$

– $\lambda^{A,B} : \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{D}(A,B)} \overset{\cong}{\Rightarrow} (j_1; (u_A \times \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{D}(A,B)})); c_{A,A,B}$

– $\rho^{A,B} : \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{D}(A,B)} \overset{\cong}{\Rightarrow} (j_2; (\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{D}(A,B)} \times u_B)); c_{A,B,B}$

are defined to be the ones whose components are the copy-cat strategies

– $\alpha^{A,B,C,D}_{\sigma,\sigma',\sigma''} \overset{\mathrm{df.}}{=} \mathrm{cp}_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma \natural \sigma' \natural \sigma'')}}$

– $\lambda^{A,B}_{\sigma} \overset{\mathrm{df.}}{=} \mathrm{cp}_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma)}}$

– $\rho^{A,B}_{\sigma} \overset{\mathrm{df.}}{=} \mathrm{cp}_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma)}}$

where $A \overset{\sigma}{\to} B \overset{\sigma'}{\to} C \overset{\sigma''}{\to} D$.

Of course, we need to verify that this structure indeed forms a bicategory. For this, we need the following lemma:

Lemma 4.1.3 (Interchange law)**.** Let A, B, C be dynamic games, which are explicit and well-opened, and $\sigma, \tau, \delta, \sigma', \tau', \delta'$ dynamic strategies such that

$$\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma) = \mathcal{H}^\omega(\tau) = \mathcal{H}^\omega(\delta) : A \multimap B$$
$$\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma') = \mathcal{H}^\omega(\tau') = \mathcal{H}^\omega(\delta') : B \multimap C$$

Let α, β be the copy-cat strategies on the game $\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma)}$ $(= \overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\tau)} = \overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\delta)})$, and α', β' the copy-cat strategies on the game $\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma')}$ $(= \overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\tau')} = \overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\delta')})$. Then we have the following equation

$$(\alpha; \beta) \downdownarrows (\alpha'; \beta') = (\alpha \downdownarrows \alpha'); (\beta \downdownarrows \beta')$$

which is called the *interchange law*.

Proof. Observe the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
(\alpha; \beta) \downdownarrows (\alpha'; \beta') &= (\mathrm{cp}_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma)}}; \mathrm{cp}_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma)}}) \downdownarrows (\mathrm{cp}_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma')}}; \mathrm{cp}_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma')}}) \\
&= \mathrm{cp}_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma)}} \downdownarrows \mathrm{cp}_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma')}} \\
&= \mathrm{cp}_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma); \mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma')}} \text{ (by Lemma 3.4.29)} \\
&= \mathrm{cp}_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma); \mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma')}}; \mathrm{cp}_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma); \mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma')}} \\
&= (\mathrm{cp}_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma)}} \downdownarrows \mathrm{cp}_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma')}}); (\mathrm{cp}_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma)}} \downdownarrows \mathrm{cp}_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma')}}) \text{ (by Lemma 3.4.29)} \\
&= (\alpha \downdownarrows \alpha'); (\beta \downdownarrows \beta')
\end{aligned}$$

□

Now, we are ready to establish the main theorem:

Theorem 4.1.4 (Well-defined $\mathcal{D}$)**.** The structure $\mathcal{D}$ in Definition 4.1.2 gives rise to a well-defined bicategory.

Proof. First, it is easy to observe that, for each pair A, B of explicit and well-opened dynamic games, the structure $\mathcal{D}(A, B)$ gives rise to a (small) category.

Next, we show that, for each triple A, B, C of 0-cells, the 1-cell and 2-cell maps

$$\begin{aligned} c_{A,B,C} : \mathcal{D}(A, B) \times \mathcal{D}(B, C) &\to \mathcal{D}(A, C) \\ (\sigma, \sigma') &\mapsto \sigma \natural \sigma' \\ (\alpha, \alpha') &\mapsto \alpha \downdownarrows \alpha' \end{aligned}$$

induce a bifunctor:

- Let $\alpha : \sigma \Rightarrow \tau$ and $\alpha' : \sigma' \Rightarrow \tau'$ be 2-cells, where $A \xrightarrow{\sigma} B \xrightarrow{\sigma'} C$, $A \xrightarrow{\tau} B \xrightarrow{\tau'} C$ are 1-cells. We must have $\sigma \approx \tau$, $\sigma' \approx \tau'$, $\alpha = \mathrm{cp}_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma)}}$ and $\alpha' = \mathrm{cp}_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma')}}$. First, $\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma \natural \sigma') = \mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma); \mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma') : A \multimap C$ by Proposition 3.5.3; thus the 1-cell map is well-defined. Next, $\sigma \natural \sigma' \approx \tau \natural \tau'$, because $\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma \natural \sigma') = \mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma); \mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma') = \mathcal{H}^\omega(\tau); \mathcal{H}^\omega(\tau') = \mathcal{H}^\omega(\tau \natural \tau')$ again by Proposition 3.5.3. Also by Propositions 3.5.3 and 3.4.29, we have $\alpha \downdownarrows \alpha' = \mathrm{cp}_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma \natural \sigma')}}$. Hence, the 2-cell map is well-defined too.
- The interchange law has been already established as Lemma 4.1.3.
- For any pair σ, σ' of objects, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{id}_\sigma \downdownarrows \mathrm{id}_{\sigma'} &= \mathrm{cp}_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma)}} \downdownarrows \mathrm{cp}_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma')}} \\ &= \mathrm{cp}_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma \natural \sigma')}} \text{ (by Propositions 3.5.3 and 3.4.29)} \\ &= \mathrm{id}_{\sigma \natural \sigma'} \end{aligned}$$

Therefore we have shown that the horizontal composition is a well-defined bifunctor. Also, it is clear that the horizontal pre-identities are well-defined.

Finally, the natural isomorphisms are clearly well-defined. Moreover the two coherence conditions hold since the relevant 2-cells are all copy-cat strategies. □

4.2 Cartesian Closed Structure

Now, we construct, based on the bicategory $\mathcal{D}$ in Definition 4.1.2, a *cartesian closed bicategory* $\mathcal{CCD}$ of dynamic games and strategies. For this, we employ the construction of [AJM00, McC98].

We follow the definition of cartesian closed bicategories in [Oua97]; but for convenience, here we use different terminologies: we call the analogous concepts in a bicategory to terminal objects, (binary) products and exponentials in a (strict) category *biterminal objects*, *(binary) biproducts* and *biexponentials*, respectively.

4.2.1 The Basic Idea of Cartesian Closed Bicategories

Before going into the details, we briefly explain the basic idea on the notion of cartesian closed bicategories. As the name suggests, it is a bicategory with the structures analogous to terminal objects, binary products, and exponentials.

The point here is that we should adopt the generalization, which is used to obtain the notion of bicategories from categories, to terminal objects, binary products, and exponentials; this is why the structures are phrased "analogous" above. Specifically, the idea of bicategories is to replace the equalities between two 1-cells with the existence of 2-cell isomorphisms. We call such a generalized equality *2-equality*:

Definition 4.2.1 (2-equalities [Oua97])**.** Two parallel 1-cells f, g are said to be **2-equal** and written $f \cong g$, if there exists a 2-cell isomorphism $\alpha : f \mathrel{\tilde{\Rightarrow}} g$.

In particular, as a consequence of adopting this idea, the notions of uniqueness and isomorphisms are now generalized:

Definition 4.2.2 (2-uniqueness [Oua97])**.** The uniqueness of a 1-cell "up to 2-cell isomorphisms" is called **2-uniqueness**.

That is, a 1-cell f is 2-unique if, for any 1-cell g (satisfying the conditions satisfied by f), there is a 2-cell isomorphism $\alpha : f \mathrel{\tilde{\Rightarrow}} g$.

Definition 4.2.3 (1-isomorphisms [Oua97])**.** A 1-cell $f : A \to B$ is said to be a **1-isomorphism**, if there exists some 1-cell $g : B \to A$ such that the compositions of f and g are 2-equal to identities, i.e., $f; g \cong \mathrm{id}_A$ and $g; f \cong \mathrm{id}_B$.

4.2.2 The Bicategory $\mathcal{CCD}$

We first establish the underlying bicategory $\mathcal{CCD}$ of dynamic games and strategies, on which we shall define a cartesian closed structure.

Definition 4.2.4 (The bicategory $\mathcal{CCD}$)**.** We define the bicategory $\mathcal{CCD}$ of dynamic games and strategies as follows:

- **0-cells.** 0-cells are explicit and well-opened dynamic games.
- **1-cells.** An arrow $\sigma : A \to B$ is a dynamic strategy σ that satisfies
$$\mathcal{H}^{\omega}(\sigma) : !A \multimap B$$
- **2-cells.** A 2-cell $\alpha : \sigma \Rightarrow \tau$ is the dereliction
$$\mathrm{der}_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^{\omega}(\sigma)}} = \mathrm{der}_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^{\omega}(\tau)}} : !\overline{\mathcal{H}^{\omega}(\sigma)} \multimap \overline{\mathcal{H}^{\omega}(\tau)}$$
if $\sigma \approx \tau$ (otherwise, there is no 2-cell between σ and τ). In other words, we define the hom-set $\mathcal{CCD}(A, B)(\sigma, \tau)$ by
$$\mathcal{CCD}(A, B)(\sigma, \tau) \stackrel{\mathrm{df.}}{=} \begin{cases} \{\mathrm{der}_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^{\omega}(\sigma)}}\} & \text{if } \sigma \approx \tau \\ \emptyset & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

- **Vertical composition.** The "vertical" composition on 2-cells is the standard (i.e., with hiding) composition with promotion";†", i.e.,

$$\alpha \,;^\dagger \beta \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \alpha^\dagger ; \beta$$

- **Vertical identity.** The identity id_σ on each 1-cell σ with respect to the vertical composition is defined to be the dereliction

$$\mathrm{der}_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma)}} : !\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma)} \multimap \overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma)}$$

- **Horizontal compositions.** The "horizontal" composition

$$c_{A,B,C} : \mathcal{CCD}(A,B) \times \mathcal{CCD}(B,C) \to \mathcal{CCD}(A,C)$$

for each triple A, B, C of 0-cells, on 1-cells is the external composition with promotion "$\natural^\dagger$", and on 2-cells is the parallel product with promotion "$\downdownarrows^\dagger$", i.e.,

$$\sigma \natural^\dagger \sigma' \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \sigma^\dagger \natural \, \sigma'$$
$$\alpha \downdownarrows^\dagger \alpha' \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \alpha^\dagger \downdownarrows \alpha'$$

- **Horizontal pre-identity.** The "pre"-identity id_A on each 0-cell A with respect to the horizontal composition on 1-cells is the dereliction

$$\mathrm{der}_A : !A \multimap A$$

- **Natural isomorphisms.** For each quadruple A, B, C, D of 0-cells, the natural isomorphisms
  - $\alpha^{A,B,C,D} : (c_{A,B,C} \times \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{CCD}(C,D)}) ; c_{A,C,D}$
    $\stackrel{\cong}{\Rightarrow} (j ; (\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{CCD}(A,B)} \times c_{B,C,D})) ; c_{A,B,D}$
  - $\lambda^{A,B} : \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{CCD}(A,B)} \stackrel{\cong}{\Rightarrow} (j_1 ; (u_A \times \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{CCD}(A,B)})) ; c_{A,A,B}$
  - $\rho^{A,B} : \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{CCD}(A,B)} \stackrel{\cong}{\Rightarrow} (j_2 ; (\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{CCD}(A,B)} \times u_B)) ; c_{A,B,B}$

  are defined to be the ones whose components are the derelictions
  - $\alpha^{A,B,C,D}_{\sigma,\sigma',\sigma''} \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \mathrm{der}_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma \natural \sigma' \natural \sigma'')}}$
  - $\lambda^{A,B}_\sigma \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \mathrm{der}_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma)}}$
  - $\rho^{A,B}_\sigma \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \mathrm{der}_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma)}}$

  where $A \stackrel{\sigma}{\to} B \stackrel{\sigma'}{\to} C \stackrel{\sigma''}{\to} D$.

We then establish:

Proposition 4.2.5 (Well-defined $\mathcal{CCD}$)**.** The structure $\mathcal{CCD}$ gives rise to a well-defined bicateogy.

Proof. First, it is easy to observe that, for each pair A, B of explicit and well-opened games, the structure $\mathcal{CCD}(A, B)$ gives rise to a (small) category:

- **Composition.** Let $\sigma \overset{\alpha}{\Rightarrow} \tau \overset{\beta}{\Rightarrow} \delta$ be a composable pair of 2-cells in $\mathcal{CCD}(A, B)$. By the definition, the existence of α, β implies $\sigma \approx \tau$, $\tau \approx \delta$, and $\alpha = \mathrm{der}_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma)}} = \beta$. Hence, we have

$$\alpha^\dagger; \beta = \mathrm{der}^\dagger_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma)}}; \mathrm{der}_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma)}} = \mathrm{cp}_{!\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma)}}; \mathrm{der}_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma)}} = \mathrm{der}_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma)}}$$

  by Proposition 3.4.29, with $\sigma \approx \delta$; thus the composition is well-defined. The associativity has been already established in the literature; e.g., see [McC98].

- **Identity.** Let $\alpha : \sigma \Rightarrow \tau$ be any 2-cell in $\mathcal{CCD}(A, B)$. Then,

$$\alpha ;^\dagger \mathrm{id}_\tau = \alpha^\dagger; \mathrm{der}_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\tau)}} = \alpha$$
$$\mathrm{id}_\sigma ;^\dagger \alpha = \mathrm{der}^\dagger_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma)}}; \alpha = \mathrm{cp}_{!\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma)}}; \alpha = \alpha$$

  by Proposition 3.4.25. Thus, the identities are well-defined.

Next, we show that, for each triple A, B, C of 0-cells, the 1-cell and 2-cell maps of the horizontal composition

$$\begin{aligned} c_{A,B,C} : \mathcal{CCD}(A, B) \times \mathcal{CCD}(B, C) &\to \mathcal{CCD}(A, C) \\ (\sigma, \sigma') &\mapsto \sigma^\dagger \natural \sigma' \\ (\alpha, \alpha') &\mapsto \alpha^\dagger \Downarrow \alpha' \end{aligned}$$

induce a bifunctor:

- Let $\alpha : \sigma \Rightarrow \tau$ and $\alpha' : \sigma' \Rightarrow \tau'$ be 2-cells, where $A \overset{\sigma}{\to} B \overset{\sigma'}{\to} C$, $A \overset{\tau}{\to} B \overset{\tau'}{\to} C$ are 1-cells. We have $\sigma \approx \tau$, $\sigma' \approx \tau'$, $\alpha = \mathrm{der}_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma)}}$ and $\alpha' = \mathrm{der}_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma')}}$. First, $\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma \natural^\dagger \sigma') = \mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma^\dagger); \mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma') = \mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma)^\dagger; \mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma') : !A \multimap C$ by the homomorphism theorem; thus the 1-cell map is well-defined. Next, we have $\sigma \natural^\dagger \sigma' \approx \tau \natural^\dagger \tau'$, because

$$\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma \natural^\dagger \sigma') = \mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma)^\dagger; \mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma') = \mathcal{H}^\omega(\tau)^\dagger; \mathcal{H}^\omega(\tau') = \mathcal{H}^\omega(\tau \natural^\dagger \tau')$$

  Also by by Proposition 3.4.29, we have

$$\alpha^\dagger \Downarrow \alpha' = \mathrm{der}^\dagger_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma)}} \Downarrow \mathrm{der}_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma')}} = \mathrm{der}_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma^\dagger \natural \sigma')}} = \mathrm{der}_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma \natural^\dagger \sigma')}}$$

  where note that $\sigma^\dagger \natural \sigma'^\dagger = (\sigma^\dagger \natural \sigma')^\dagger$. Hence, the 2-cell map is well-defined too.

- Additionally, let $\beta : \sigma \Rightarrow \tau$ and $\beta' : \sigma' \Rightarrow \tau'$ be 2-cells. Then similar to Lemma 4.1.3, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(\alpha^\dagger \between \alpha')^\dagger ; (\beta^\dagger \between \beta') &= (\mathrm{der}^\dagger_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma)}} \between \mathrm{der}_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma')}})^\dagger ; (\mathrm{der}^\dagger_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma)}} \between \mathrm{der}_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma')}}) \\
&= \mathrm{der}^\dagger_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma^\dagger \natural \sigma')}} ; \mathrm{der}_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma^\dagger \natural \sigma')}} \\
&= \mathrm{der}_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma^\dagger \natural \sigma')}} \\
&= \mathrm{der}^\dagger_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma)}} \between \mathrm{der}_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma')}} \\
&= (\mathrm{der}^\dagger_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma)}} ; \mathrm{der}_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma)}})^\dagger \between (\mathrm{der}^\dagger_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma')}} ; \mathrm{der}_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma')}}) \\
&= (\alpha^\dagger ; \beta)^\dagger \between (\alpha'^\dagger ; \beta')
\end{aligned}$$

- For the identities, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{id}^\dagger_\sigma \between \mathrm{id}_{\sigma'} &= \mathrm{der}^\dagger_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma)}} \between \mathrm{der}_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma')}} \\
&= \mathrm{der}_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma^\dagger \natural \sigma')}} \\
&= \mathrm{id}_{\sigma \natural^\dagger \sigma'}
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore we have shown that $c_{A,B,C}$ is a well-defined bifunctor.

Finally, the natural isomorphisms are clearly well-defined. Moreover the two coherence conditions hold since there are just derelictions. □

Below, we shall equip $\mathcal{CCD}$ with a cartesian closed structure, i.e., define a biterminal object, biproducts, and biexponentials in $\mathcal{CCD}$.

4.2.3 Biterminal Objects

We first recall the notion of a *biterminal object*. Roughly speaking, an object is a biterminal object if there is a 2-unique 1-cell from each object to it.

Definition 4.2.6 (Biterminal objects [Oua97])**.** A **biterminal object** in a bicategory $\mathcal{B}$ is an object $T \in \mathcal{B}$ equipped with a collection $(!_A : A \to T)_{A \in \mathcal{B}}$ of 1-cells and a collection $(\zeta^A : \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{B}(A,T)} \overset{\cong}{\Rightarrow} \mathrm{cst}_{!_A} : \mathcal{B}(A,T) \to \mathcal{B}(A,T))_{A \in \mathcal{B}}$ of natural isomorphisms, where $\mathrm{cst}_{!_A}$ is the constant functor at $!_A$.

Similar to a terminal object, we have:

Proposition 4.2.7 (Uniqueness of biterminal objects [Oua97])**.** There is a 2-unique 1-isomorphism between any two biterminal objects.

Proof. See [Oua97]. □

Now, we define a biterminal object in the bicategory $\mathcal{CCD}$ of dynamic games and strategies.

Definition 4.2.8 (Biterminal games)**.** We define a **biterminal game** in the bicategory $\mathcal{CCD}$ of dynamic games and strategies to be the terminal game

$$I = (\emptyset, \emptyset, \emptyset, \{\epsilon\})$$

equipped with the 1-cells $!_A \overset{\text{df.}}{=} \bot$ for all $A \in \mathcal{CCD}$ and the natural isomorphisms ζ^A with the components $\zeta^A_f \overset{\text{df.}}{=} \bot$ for all $A \in \mathcal{CCD}, f \in \mathcal{CCD}(A, I)$.

It is immediate that this structure forms a well-defined biterminal object; we record this as:

Proposition 4.2.9 (Well-defined biterminal games)**.** The biterminal game I forms a well-defined biterminal object in the bicategory $\mathcal{CCD}$.

Proof. Immediate. □

4.2.4 Binary Biproducts

Next, we introduce the notion of binary biproducts.

Definition 4.2.10 (Binary biproducts [Oua97])**.** Let $\mathcal{B}$ be a bicategory. A **binary biproduct** of two objects $A, B \in \mathcal{B}$ consists of the following data:

- An object $A \times B \in \mathcal{B}$ and 1-cells $\pi_1^{A,B} : A \times B \to A$, $\pi_2^{A,B} : A \times B \to B$. We often drop the superscripts.
- For each object $C \in \mathcal{B}$, a **paring functor**

  $$\langle \_, \_ \rangle^C_{A,B} : \mathcal{B}(C, A) \times \mathcal{B}(C, B) \to \mathcal{B}(C, A \times B)$$

  We often drop the superscripts and/or subscripts.
- For each object $C \in \mathcal{B}$, natural isomorphisms

  $$\iota^{C,A\times B} : \langle \_, \_ \rangle ; \mathcal{B}(C, \pi_1) \overset{\cong}{\Rightarrow} \mathrm{prj}_1 : \mathcal{B}(C, A) \times \mathcal{B}(C, B) \to \mathcal{B}(C, A)$$
  $$\kappa^{C,A\times B} : \langle \_, \_ \rangle ; \mathcal{B}(C, \pi_2) \overset{\cong}{\Rightarrow} \mathrm{prj}_2 : \mathcal{B}(C, A) \times \mathcal{B}(C, B) \to \mathcal{B}(C, B)$$
  $$\mu^{C,A\times B} : \langle \mathcal{B}(C, \pi_1), \mathcal{B}(C, \pi_2) \rangle ; \langle \_, \_ \rangle \overset{\cong}{\Rightarrow} \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{B}(C,A\times B)} : \mathcal{B}(C, A \times B) \to \mathcal{B}(C, A \times B)$$

  where prj_i are the obvious projection functors, and $\mathcal{B}(C, \pi_i)$ are the "post-composition by π_i" functors, i.e., writing A_1, A_2 for A, B, respectively,

  $$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}(C, \pi_i) : \mathcal{B}(C, A_1 \times A_2) &\to \mathcal{B}(C, A_i) \\ f &\mapsto f ; \pi_i \\ \alpha &\mapsto \alpha \,\|\, \mathrm{id}_{\pi_i} \end{aligned}$$

  for $i = 1, 2$, and $\langle \mathcal{B}(C, \pi_1), \mathcal{B}(C, \pi_2) \rangle : \mathcal{B}(C, A \times B) \to \mathcal{B}(C, A) \times \mathcal{B}(C, B)$ is the obvious paring functor in the category CAT of small categories and functors (CAT itself forms a cartesian closed bicategory). Again, we often drop the superscripts and/or subscripts.



Table 7: The biproduct coherence conditions

which satisfy the following two coherence conditions:

1. For any object $C \in \mathcal{B}$ and 1-cell $h : C \to A \times B$ in $\mathcal{B}$, we have

$$\langle \mu_h^{-1} \| \mathrm{id}_{\pi_1}, \mu_h^{-1} \| \mathrm{id}_{\pi_2} \rangle \ddagger \langle \iota_{h;\pi_1,h;\pi_2}, \kappa_{h;\pi_1,h;\pi_2} \rangle = \mathrm{id}_{\langle h;\pi_1,h;\pi_2\rangle} \text{ (see Table 7)}$$

2. For any object $C \in \mathcal{B}$ and 1-cells $f : C \to A$, $g : C \to B$ in $\mathcal{B}$, we have

$$\mu^{-1}_{\langle f,g\rangle} \ddagger \langle \iota_{f,g}, \kappa_{f,g} \rangle = \mathrm{id}_{\langle f,g\rangle} \text{ (see Table 7)}$$

Intuitively, the notion of a biproduct is a generalization of the usual product, in which the required equations are relaxed "up to 2-cell isomorphisms". The "pared" 1-cells $\langle f, g\rangle$ are unique "up to 2-cell isomorphisms" (analogous to the uniqueness condition of the universal mapping property of products), as the following proposition states:

Proposition 4.2.11 (2-uniqueness of the paired arrows [Oua97])**.** Given a biproduct $A \overset{\pi_1}{\leftarrow} A \times B \overset{\pi_2}{\rightarrow} B$ of the objects A, B in a bicategory $\mathcal{B}$, with the paring functor $\langle \_, \_ \rangle$, the paired 1-cell

$$\langle f, g\rangle : C \to A \times B$$

for any object $C \in \mathcal{B}$ and 1-cells $f : C \to A$, $g : C \to B$ in $\mathcal{B}$, is unique up to 2-cell isomorphisms with respect to the property $\langle f, g\rangle;\pi_1 \cong f$ and $\langle f, g\rangle;\pi_2 \cong g$.

Proof. Assume that a 1-cell $k : C \to A \times B$ in $\mathcal{B}$ satisfies $k; \pi_1 \cong f$ and $k; \pi_2 \cong g$. Then we have

$$\langle f, g \rangle \cong \langle k; \pi_1, k; \pi_2 \rangle \cong k$$

because of the preservation of 2-equality $\cong$ under functor and the natural isomorphism μ of the product. □

Also, a biproduct is unique "up to 2-unique 1-cell isomorphisms":

Proposition 4.2.12 (Uniqueness of biproducts [Oua97])**.** Let $A \overset{\pi_1}{\leftarrow} A \times B \overset{\pi_2}{\rightarrow} B$ be a biproduct of objects A and B in a bicategory $\mathcal{B}$. If $A \overset{p_1}{\leftarrow} P \overset{p_2}{\rightarrow} B$ is also a product of A and B, then there exists a 2-unique 1-cell isomorphism $i : P \to A \times B$ that satisfies $i; \pi_1 \cong p_1$ and $i; \pi_2 \cong p_2$.

Proof. Let $\langle \_, \_ \rangle$ and $[\_, \_]$ be the paring functors of the products $A \times B$ and P, respectively. We take $i \overset{\text{df.}}{=} \langle p_1, p_2 \rangle$. By Proposition 4.2.11, i is 2-unique with respect to the property $i; \pi_1 \cong p_1$ and $i; \pi_2 \cong p_2$. It remains to show that i is a 1-cell isomorphism.

Let $j \overset{\text{df.}}{=} [\pi_1, \pi_2] : A \times B \to P$. We shall show that $j; i \cong \mathrm{id}_{A \times B}$ and $i; j \cong \mathrm{id}_P$. Note that we have

$$(j; i); \pi_1 \cong j; (i; \pi_1) \cong j; p_1 \cong \pi_1$$

and similarly $(j; i); \pi_2 \cong \pi_2$. But $\mathrm{id}_{A \times B}$ also satisfies $\mathrm{id}_{A \times B}; \pi_1 \cong \pi_1$ and $\mathrm{id}_{A \times B}; \pi_2 \cong \pi_2$. Hence, by Proposition 4.2.11, we may conclude $j; i \cong \mathrm{id}_{A \times B}$. By a symmetric argument, we can show $i; j \cong \mathrm{id}_P$ as well. □

Based on the binary product of games defined previously, we define the binary biproduct of dynamic games.

Definition 4.2.13 (Biproduct games)**.** For any pair of games $A, B \in \mathcal{CCD}$, we define their **biproduct game** $A \& B$ as follows:

- $A \& B$ is the product of A and B
- The projections are

  $$\pi_1 \overset{\text{df.}}{=} \mathrm{der}_{A \& B}; \mathrm{fst} : !(A \& B) \multimap A$$
  $$\pi_2 \overset{\text{df.}}{=} \mathrm{der}_{A \& B}; \mathrm{snd} : !(A \& B) \multimap B$$

  where $\mathrm{fst} : A \& B \multimap A$ and $\mathrm{snd} : A \& B \multimap B$ are the obvious copy-cat strategies.
- For the paring functor $\langle \_, \_ \rangle^C_{A,B}$, for each game $C \in \mathcal{CCD}$, its 1-cell map is defined to be just the paring $\langle \_, \_ \rangle$ of strategies, and its 2-cell map is defined to be as follows: for any 2-cells $\alpha : \sigma \Rightarrow \tau$, $\alpha' : \sigma' \Rightarrow \tau'$, where $\sigma, \tau : C \to A$

and $\sigma', \tau' : C \to B$, the pairing $\langle \alpha, \alpha' \rangle^C_{A,B} : \langle \sigma, \sigma' \rangle^C_{A,B} \Rightarrow \langle \tau, \tau' \rangle^C_{A,B}$ is defined by

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \alpha, \alpha' \rangle^C_{A,B} &\stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \{s \in L \mid (s \restriction C, A \in \alpha \wedge s \restriction B = \epsilon) \vee (s \restriction C, B \in \alpha' \wedge s \restriction A = \epsilon)\} \\ &\cong \alpha + \alpha'\end{aligned}$$

where L is the set of legal positions of the game $\overline{\langle \sigma, \sigma' \rangle^C_{A,B} \Rightarrow \langle \tau, \tau' \rangle^C_{A,B}}$.

- The natural isomorphisms $\iota^{C,A\times B}, \kappa^{C,A\times B}, \mu^{C,A\times B}$ for each $C \in \mathcal{CCD}$ are defined to be the ones whose components are the corresponding derelictions.

Of course, we need to establish the following:

Proposition 4.2.14 (Well-defined biproduct games)**.** The biproduct game $A\&B$ of any pair of games A, B forms a well-defined biproduct in the bicategory $\mathcal{CCD}$.

Proof. Let $\alpha : \sigma \Rightarrow \tau$, $\alpha' : \sigma' \Rightarrow \tau'$ be 2-cells, where $\sigma, \tau : C \to A$ and $\sigma', \tau' : C \to B$ in the bicategory $\mathcal{CCD}$. By the definition, it implies $\sigma \approx \tau$, $\sigma' \approx \tau'$, $\alpha = \mathrm{der}_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma)}}$ and $\alpha' = \mathrm{der}_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma')}}$.

First, it is immediate to see that $\langle \alpha, \alpha' \rangle$ is a well-defined strategy on the game $\langle \sigma, \sigma' \rangle \Rightarrow \langle \tau, \tau' \rangle$. Also, $\langle \sigma, \tau \rangle \approx \langle \sigma', \tau' \rangle$, because

$$\mathcal{H}^\omega(\langle \sigma, \tau \rangle) = \langle \mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma), \mathcal{H}^\omega(\tau) \rangle = \langle \mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma'), \mathcal{H}^\omega(\tau') \rangle = \mathcal{H}^\omega(\langle \sigma', \tau' \rangle)$$

by the homomorphism theorem. Moreover, by the unit law below, the paring of identities (derelictions) is again an identity (a dereliction). Thus $\langle \_, \_ \rangle$ is well-defined on 2-cells too.

Next, we verify the functoriality of the paring $\langle \_, \_ \rangle$.

- **Interchange law.** Additionally, let $\beta : \tau \Rightarrow \delta$, $\beta' : \tau' \Rightarrow \delta'$ be 2-cells, where $\delta : C \to A$ and $\delta' : C \to B$. We have to establish

$$\langle \alpha, \alpha' \rangle^\dagger ; \langle \beta, \beta' \rangle = \langle \alpha^\dagger ; \beta, \alpha'^\dagger ; \beta' \rangle : \langle \sigma, \sigma' \rangle \Rightarrow \langle \delta, \delta' \rangle$$

Then in fact,

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \alpha, \alpha' \rangle ; \langle \beta, \beta' \rangle &= \langle \mathrm{der}_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma)}}, \mathrm{der}_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma')}} \rangle^\dagger ; \langle \mathrm{der}_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma)}}, \mathrm{der}_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma')}} \rangle \\ &= \mathrm{der}^\dagger_{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\langle \sigma, \sigma' \rangle)} ; \mathrm{der}_{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\langle \sigma, \sigma' \rangle)} \text{ (by the unit law below)} \\ &= \mathrm{der}_{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\langle \sigma, \sigma' \rangle)} \\ &= \langle \mathrm{der}_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma)}}, \mathrm{der}_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma')}} \rangle \text{ (again by the unit law)} \\ &= \langle \mathrm{der}^\dagger_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma)}} ; \mathrm{der}_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma)}}, \mathrm{der}^\dagger_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma')}} ; \mathrm{der}_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma')}} \rangle \\ &= \langle \alpha^\dagger ; \beta, \alpha'^\dagger ; \beta' \rangle\end{aligned}$$

- **Unit law.** We now assume $\sigma \approx \tau$ and $\sigma' \approx \tau'$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \mathrm{id}_\sigma, \mathrm{id}_{\sigma'} \rangle &= \langle \mathrm{der}_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma)}}, \mathrm{der}_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma')}} \rangle \\ &= \mathrm{der}_{\overline{\langle \mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma), \mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma') \rangle}} \text{ (by the definition of the paring functor)} \\ &= \mathrm{der}_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\langle \sigma, \sigma' \rangle)}} \text{ (by the homomorphism theorem)} \\ &= \mathrm{id}_{\langle \sigma, \sigma' \rangle}\end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have established that $\langle \_, \_ \rangle$ forms a well-defined functor.

Next, note that the domain and codomain of each component of ι (resp. κ, μ) are externally equal 1-cells, so ι (resp. κ, μ) is in fact a well-defined natural isomorphism. Moreover, the two coherence conditions clearly hold, because only derelictions are involved here, and we have already established the unit law. □

4.2.5 Biexponentials

Finally, we introduce the notion of exponentials in bicategories, called *biexponentials*.

Definition 4.2.15 (Biexponentials [Oua97])**.** Let $\mathcal{B}$ be a bicategory with all binary biproducts. A **biexponential** of objects $B, C \in \mathcal{B}$ consists of the following data:

- An object $C^B \in \mathcal{B}$
- A 1-cell $\mathrm{ev}_{B,C} : C^B \times B \to C$, called the **evaluation**, where $C^B \times B$ is a biproduct with the paring functor $\langle \_, \_ \rangle^A_{C^B,C}$ for each object $A \in \mathcal{B}$.
- For each object $A \in \mathcal{B}$, a functor $\widetilde{(\_)}_{A,C^B} : \mathcal{B}(A \times B, C) \to \mathcal{B}(A, C^B)$, called the **biexponentiation**.
- For each object $A \in \mathcal{B}$, two natural isomorphisms

  $\upsilon^{A,C^B} : (\widetilde{(\_)} \times \mathrm{id}_B); \mathcal{B}(A \times B, \mathrm{ev}_{B,C}) \overset{\cong}{\Rightarrow} \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{B}(A \times B, C)} : \mathcal{B}(A \times B, C) \to \mathcal{B}(A \times B, C)$

  $\chi^{A,C^B} : ((\_) \times \mathrm{id}_B); \widetilde{\mathcal{B}(A \times B, \mathrm{ev}_{B,C})} \overset{\cong}{\Rightarrow} \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{B}(A, C^B)} : \mathcal{B}(A, C^B) \to \mathcal{B}(A, C^B)$

  where we write

$$\begin{aligned} h_1 \times h_2 &\overset{\text{df.}}{=} \langle \pi_1; h_1, \pi_2; h_2 \rangle : A \times B \to C_1 \times C_2 \\ \alpha_1 \times \alpha_2 &\overset{\text{df.}}{=} \langle \mathrm{id}_{\pi_1} \| \alpha_1, \mathrm{id}_{\pi_2} \| \alpha_2 \rangle : h_1 \times h_2 \Rightarrow k_1 \times k_2 \end{aligned}$$

  for any $h_1, k_1 : A \to C_1, h_2, k_2 : B \to C_2$, $\alpha_1 : h_1 \Rightarrow k_1, \alpha_2 : h_2 \Rightarrow k_2$, and $(\_) \times \mathrm{id}_B$ is the functor defined by

$$\begin{aligned} (\_) \times \mathrm{id}_B : \mathcal{B}(A, C^B) &\to \mathcal{B}(A \times B, C^B \times B) \\ g &\mapsto g \times \mathrm{id}_B \\ \beta &\mapsto \beta \times i_B \end{aligned}$$

  for any $g, l : A \to C^B$, $\beta : g \Rightarrow l$, that satisfy the following two coherence conditions



Table 8: The biexponential coherence conditions

1. For any object $A \in \mathcal{B}$ and 1-cell $g : A \to C^B$ in $\mathcal{B}$, we have

$$((\chi_g^{A,C^B})^{-1} \times i_B \| \mathrm{id}_{\mathrm{ev}_{B,C}}) \ddagger \upsilon^{A,C^B}_{(g\times \mathrm{id}_B);\mathrm{ev}_{B,C}} = \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{B}(A\times B,C)} \text{ (see Table 8)}$$

2. For any object $A \in \mathcal{B}$ and 1-cell $f : A \times B \to C$ in $\mathcal{B}$, we have

$$(\chi_{\widetilde{f}}^{A,C^B})^{-1} \ddagger \widetilde{\upsilon_f^{A,C^B}} = \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{B}(A,C^B)} \text{ (see Table 8)}$$

That is, a biexponential is a generalization of an exponential, in which the required equations hold "up to 2-cell isomorphisms".

As expected, a biexponential is unique in a suitable sense:

Proposition 4.2.16 (Uniqueness of biexponentials [Oua97])**.** Assume that there are two biexponentials of objects B and C in a bicategory $\mathcal{B}$, $(C^B, \mathrm{ev}, \widetilde{(\_)}, \upsilon, \chi)$ and $(E, \epsilon, \widehat{(\_)}, \upsilon', \chi')$. Then,

1. There is a 2-unique 1-cell isomorphism between C^B and E;
2. There is a 2-cell isomorphism between ev and ϵ.

Proof. See [Oua97]. □

Now, we define biexponentials in the bicategory of dynamic games and strategies.

Definition 4.2.17 (Biexponential games)**.** For any pair of games $B, C \in \mathcal{CCD}$, we define their **biexponential game** as the structure which consists of the following data:

- The exponential game C^B.
- The evaluation strategy $\mathrm{der}_{C^B \& B}; \mathrm{ev}_{B,C} : !(C^B \& B) \multimap C$.
- The biexponentiation functor $\widetilde{(\_)}_{A,C^B} : \mathcal{B}(!(A \& B), C) \to \mathcal{B}(!A, C^B)$ is defined by taking the currying operation as the 1-cell map, and the corresponding "tag-adjusting" operation as the 2-cell map.
- For each object $A \in \mathcal{C}$, we take the natural isomorphisms $\upsilon^{A,C^B}, \chi^{A,C^B}$ as the families of the components

$$\upsilon_\sigma^{A,C^B} \stackrel{\mathrm{df.}}{=} \mathrm{der}_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma)}}$$
$$\chi_\tau^{A,C^B} \stackrel{\mathrm{df.}}{=} \mathrm{der}_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\tau)}}$$

  where σ, τ are 1-cells with $\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma) : !(A \& B) \multimap C$, $\mathcal{H}^\omega(\tau) : !A \multimap C^B$.

We finally establish the following

Proposition 4.2.18 (Well-defined biexponential games)**.** Biexponential games are well-defined biexponentials in the bicategory $\mathcal{CCD}$.

Proof. Fix arbitrary games $B, C \in \mathcal{CCD}$; we show that the biexponential game of B and C forms a biexponential in $\mathcal{CCD}$. We first establish the functoriality of the biexponentiation functor $\widetilde{(\_)}_{A,C^B}$ for each $A \in \mathcal{C}$:

- First, observe that, for any strategy σ with $\sigma^h : A \times B \to C$,

$$\widetilde{\mathrm{id}_\sigma} = \widetilde{\mathrm{der}_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma)}}} = \mathrm{der}_{\overline{\widetilde{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma)}}} = \mathrm{der}_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\widetilde{\sigma})}} = \mathrm{id}_{\widetilde{\sigma}}$$

- Let σ, τ, δ be strategies such that $\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma) = \mathcal{H}^\omega(\tau) = \mathcal{H}^\omega(\delta) : A \times B \to C$. Then any 2-cells $\alpha : \sigma \Rightarrow \tau$, $\beta : \tau \Rightarrow \delta$ are the dereliction $\mathrm{der}_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma)}}$. Then

by the above equation, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\widetilde{(\alpha^\dagger;\beta)} &= \widetilde{\mathrm{der}^\dagger_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma)}}};\widetilde{\mathrm{der}_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma)}}} \\
&= \widetilde{\mathrm{der}_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma)}}} \\
&= \mathrm{der}_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\widetilde{\sigma})}} \\
&= \mathrm{der}^\dagger_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\widetilde{\sigma})}};\mathrm{der}_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\widetilde{\sigma})}} \\
&= \widetilde{\mathrm{der}_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma)}}}^{\dagger};\widetilde{\mathrm{der}_{\overline{\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma)}}} \\
&= \widetilde{\alpha}^\dagger;\widetilde{\beta}
\end{aligned}$$

Next, note that for any object $A \in \mathcal{CCD}$ and 1-cells $\sigma : A \times B \to C$, $\tau : A \to C^B$, we have

$$(\widetilde{\sigma} \times \mathrm{der}_B)^\dagger \natural (\mathrm{der}_{C^B \& B}; \mathrm{ev}_{B,C}) \cong \sigma$$
$$(\tau \times \mathrm{der}_B) \natural \widetilde{(\mathrm{der}_{C^B \& B}; \mathrm{ev}_{B,C})} \cong \tau$$

where note that the biexponentialtion functor in the second line is applied to the external composition. Hence, the natural isomorphisms υ^{A,C^B}, χ^{A,C^B} are clearly well-defined. Moreover, since the strategies involved are all derelictions, the coherence conditions are clearly satisfied. □

As a result, we have established:

Theorem 4.2.19 (Cartesian closed bicategory $\mathcal{CCD}$)**.** The bicategory $\mathcal{CCD}$ of dynamic games and strategies is cartesian closed.

Moreover, as we have seen so far, all the entities and constructions can be restricted to *fully* dynamic games and strategies. Hence we obtain:

Corollary 4.2.20 (Cartesian closed bicateogory $\mathcal{CCFD}$)**.** The category $\mathcal{CCFD}$ of fully dynamic games and strategies, which is a full subcategory of $\mathcal{CCD}$, forms a cartesian closed bicategory.

4.3 Hiding Functor

We defined the hiding operation $\mathcal{H}^\omega$ on both dynamic games and strategies, and showed that it preserves the typing relation: If we have a dynamic strategy $\sigma : G$, then $\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma) : \mathcal{H}^\omega(G)$.

From this result, it is natural to expect that the operation forms a functor $\mathcal{H}^\omega : \mathcal{CCD} \to \mathbb{HO}$, where $\mathbb{HO}$ is the cartesian closed category of HO-games and strategies presented in [McC98]. In fact, we have:

Proposition 4.3.1 (Hiding functor)**.** The hiding operation $\mathcal{H}^\omega$ on dynamic games and strategies forms a functor

$$\mathcal{H}^\omega : \mathcal{CCD} \to \mathbb{HO}$$

Proof. Again, since the games and strategies of $\mathbb{HO}$ can be seen as particular dynamic games and strategies, namely the explicit ones, the object and arrow maps of $\mathcal{H}^\omega$ are clearly well-defined. We have to show the functoriality of $\mathcal{H}^\omega$.

1. Let $\sigma : A \to B$ be a morphism in $\mathcal{CCD}$, i.e., $\sigma : !A \multimap B$ is a dynamic strategy. By Theorems 3.2.3 and 2.6.5, $\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma)$ is a strategy on the game $!\mathcal{H}^\omega(A) \multimap \mathcal{H}^\omega(B)$, i.e., $\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma) : \mathcal{H}^\omega(A) \to \mathcal{H}^\omega(B)$ in $\mathbb{HO}$.

2. Let $A \xrightarrow{\sigma} B \xrightarrow{\sigma'} C$ be a composable pair of 1-cells in $\mathcal{CCD}$. We have already shown that $\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma \natural \sigma') = \mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma); \mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma')$ in Proposition 3.5.3.

3. For any object $A \in \mathcal{CCD}$, we have $\mathcal{H}^\omega(\mathrm{id}_A) = \mathcal{H}^\omega(\mathrm{cp}_A) = \mathrm{cp}_A = \mathrm{cp}_{\mathcal{H}^\omega(A)}$, where note that A must be explicit.

□

Remark 4.3.2. One may think that the structure $(\mathcal{H}, \mathrm{id}, (\_)^h)$ would give rise to a comonad on $\mathcal{CCD}$; however, it does not. This is because, for any $\sigma : A \multimap B$, we have $\sigma^h; \mathrm{id}_B = \sigma^h$, not $\sigma^h; \mathrm{id}_B = \sigma$.

5 Game-semantic Computational Process

In game semantics, the notion of a computation is formulated as a play of a game. For example, the process of computing the result of applying the successor function twice to 0 is formulated as the play described in Table 9.

More precisely, it is a play by a strategy corresponding the function application $\mathrm{succ}^2(0)$. Note, in particular, that the composition employed here is the *non-hiding* composition; so the internal process of the computation is explicitly described. In this instance, we propose our *game-semantic computational process* as the transformation from that play into the play of 2, which corresponds to deleting all the internal moves.

Note that it is *not* the process of transforming strategies; rather it is to transform *plays*. However, if a play by a strategy has just one possible O-move for each external O's turn, then the strategy must be a single-path tree, i.e., a play, thanks to the axioms (V3) and (S2). We assume that in that case Player can "play alone", i.e., without Opponent, and so she can transform the strategy. That is, the computational process is applicable to a strategy if the strategy is deterministic on every external O-move.

Notice that this formulation reflects the phenomenon in syntax that a λ-abstraction cannot be reduced further even if the sub-term inside the abstraction has not been fully reduced. More in general, it seems relevant to the fact that the notions of computational soundness and adequacy can be reasonably defined only on terms of ground types. However, we shall consider such connections with syntax as a future work, and here we just make precise the computational process sketched above.

We shall propose two algorithms for the computational process: the algorithms SEQ and HID.

Remark 5.0.3. Even if a strategy is not a single-path tree, as long as it is a finite set, then we may apply the process and it will always terminate. This issue should be addressed in the next paper.

5.1 Algorithm SEQ

The first algorithm for the game-semantic computational process is to hide internal moves in a play "as the play proceeds".

Algorithm 5.1.1 (Algorithm SEQ)**.** Given a strategy $\sigma : G$ on a game G, Algorithm SEQ transforms σ by iterating the following process:

1. Proceed a play "alone": If Player is to move next, then follow σ if it has the next P-move; stop otherwise. If Opponent is to move next, then take the O-move if it is the only possible next O-move; stop otherwise.

2. During 1, if find an internal QA-pair, then delete it.

Note that we always delete a QA-pair, because if we had deleted a question first, then there is no question to answer.

I	$\overset{0}{\multimap}$	N	N	$\overset{\text{succ}}{\multimap}$	N	N	$\overset{\text{succ}}{\multimap}$	N
								q
						q		
					q			
			q					
		q						
		0						
			0					
					1			
						1		
								2

Table 9: The play of $\text{succ}^2(0)$

5.2 Algorithm HID

The second algorithm is to simply follow the hiding operation.

Algorithm 5.2.1 (Algorithm HID)**.** Given a strategy $\sigma : G$ on a game G, Algorithm HID transforms σ into $\mathcal{H}^\omega(\sigma)$ by simply applying the hiding operation $\mathcal{H}$ iteratively until the strategy has become in normal form.

Note that this algorithm exploits the hierarchical structure of internal moves.

6 Future Works

At last, we list some of the future works here.

- Note that the structures and operations proposed in this paper are mathematical or "semantic". Thus, it would be fruitful to see the corresponding phenomena in syntax. (For this, we shall first establish a model of programming languages, which should be straightforward, as our games and strategies are a generalization of the existing ones and have the cartesian closed structure.)

- In particular, we are interested in the correspondence between the game-semantic computational process and syntactic reduction. More concretely, we aim to establish the following property: Let $\mathcal{L}$ be an appropriate programming language with a small-step operational semantics $\to$, and $[\![\_]\!]$ the interpretation of $\mathcal{L}$ in $\mathcal{CCFD}$ with the hiding operation $\blacktriangleright \stackrel{\text{df.}}{=} \mathcal{H}$.

  Conjecture 6.0.2 (Dynamic correspondence property)**.** For any terms t_1, t_2 in the language $\mathcal{L}$, if we have a single-step reduction $t_1 \to t_2$, then the following diagram commutes:

  $$\begin{array}{ccc} t_1 & \to & t_2 \\ \llbracket \_ \rrbracket \vdots & & \vdots \llbracket \_ \rrbracket \\ \llbracket t_1 \rrbracket & \blacktriangleright & \llbracket t_2 \rrbracket \end{array}$$

  where the dotted arrows represent the interpretation $[\![\_]\!]$.

  Note that we need to consider "finer" equations between terms in syntax, reflecting our finer equations between dynamic strategies.

- We have explicitly formulated the hiding operation which was implicit in the existing game semantics. Thus, proceeding further to this direction, we would like to axiomatize elementary computational steps or characterize the notion of effective computability in the framework of game semantics so that it would be an independent mathematical model of computation (in the sense of, say, Turing machines).

- In particular, such a model of computation would formalize *intensionality* in computation. Then, e.g., it would be useful as a computational complexity measure.

- The notion of external equality defined in the present paper appears corresponding to the propositional equality in homotopy type theory [V+13]. This is because, conceptually, the propositional equality is the equality that can be constructively provable, and the external equality can be "witnessed" by the corresponding copy-cat strategy. It would be fruitful to investigate this connection.

- Moreover, assuming that our games and strategies have indeced a model of computation, it would be in some sense a "computational justification" of homotopy type theory to establish its interpretation by our games and strategies (it would be an alternative approach to the cubical sets model [BCH14]). It would be meaningful because the original aim of Martin-Löf type theory [ML84, ML98] is to give a foundation of constructive mathematics.

A Proofs of Technical Lemmata

A.1 Independent View in Tensor Products

Lemma A.1.1 (Independent view in tensor products)**.** Let A and B be games. Then for any valid position $s.m \in P_{A \otimes B}$ of their tensor, we have

$$\lceil s.m \rceil = \begin{cases} \lceil s.m \upharpoonright A \rceil & \text{if } m \in M_A \\ \lceil s.m \upharpoonright B \rceil & \text{if } m \in M_B \end{cases}$$

Proof. By induction on the length of s.

Base case. Assume $s = \epsilon$. If $m \in M_A$, then we clearly have $\lceil m \rceil = \lceil m \upharpoonright A \rceil$; similarly, if $m \in M_B$ then clearly $\lceil m \rceil = \lceil m \upharpoonright B \rceil$.

Induction step Assume $s = s'.n$. First consider the case $n \in M_A$. We proceed by the following case analysis:

- If n is an initial move, then $\lceil s \rceil = n = \lceil s \upharpoonright A \rceil$.
- If n is a non-initial O-move, then s must be in the form of $t.m.t'.n$, where n is justified by m. So we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lceil s \rceil &= \lceil t \rceil .m.n \\ &= \lceil t \upharpoonright A \rceil .m.n \text{ (by induction hypothesis)} \\ &= \lceil (t \upharpoonright A).m.(t' \upharpoonright A).n \rceil \\ &= \lceil t.m.t'.n \upharpoonright A \rceil \\ &= \lceil s \upharpoonright A \rceil \end{aligned}$$

- If n is a P-move, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lceil s \rceil &= \lceil s'.n \rceil \\ &= \lceil s' \rceil .n \\ &= \lceil s' \upharpoonright A \rceil .n \text{ (by induction hypothesis)} \\ &\quad \text{(note that the last move of } s' \text{ must be an } A\text{-move)} \\ &= \lceil s'.n \upharpoonright A \rceil \\ &= \lceil s \upharpoonright A \rceil \end{aligned}$$

The case $n \in M_A$ can be dealt with in the same way.

□

A.2 View Lemma EI

Lemma A.2.1 (View lemma EI)**.** Let J, K be games such that $\mathcal{H}(J) = A \multimap B$ and $\mathcal{H}(K) = B \multimap C$. Then for any valid position $s \in P_{J \triangleright K}$, we have

1. If the last move of s is in $M_J \setminus M_{B_1}$, then
$$\lceil s \upharpoonright J \rceil_J \preceq \lceil s \rceil_{J \triangleright K} \upharpoonright J$$
$$\lfloor s \upharpoonright J \rfloor_J \preceq \lfloor s \rfloor_{J \triangleright K} \upharpoonright J$$

2. If the last move of s is in $M_K \setminus M_{B_2}$, then
$$\lceil s \upharpoonright K \rceil_K \preceq \lceil s \rceil_{J \triangleright K} \upharpoonright K$$
$$\lfloor s \upharpoonright K \rfloor_K \preceq \lfloor s \rfloor_{J \triangleright K} \upharpoonright K$$

3. If the last move of s is an O-move in $M_{B_1} \cup M_{B_2}$, then
$$\lceil s \upharpoonright B_1, B_2 \rceil_{B_1 \multimap B_2} \preceq \lfloor s \rfloor_{J \triangleright K} \upharpoonright B_1, B_2$$
$$\lfloor s \upharpoonright B_1, B_2 \rfloor_{B_1 \multimap B_2} \preceq \lceil s \rceil_{J \triangleright K} \upharpoonright B_1, B_2$$

Proof. We proceed by induction on the length of s. Let $s = tm$. If m is initial, then it is trivial: for the clause 2,

$$\lceil s \upharpoonright K \rceil_K = \lceil (t \upharpoonright K).m \rceil_K = m = m \upharpoonright K = \lceil tm \rceil_{J \triangleright K} \upharpoonright K = \lceil s \rceil_{J \triangleright K} \upharpoonright K$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\lfloor s \upharpoonright K \rfloor_K &= \lfloor (t \upharpoonright K).m \rfloor_K \\
&= \lfloor t \upharpoonright K \rfloor_K.m \\
&\preceq (\lfloor t \rfloor_{J \triangleright K} \upharpoonright K).m \text{ (by the induction hypothesis)} \\
&= (\lfloor t \rfloor_{J \triangleright K}).m \upharpoonright K \\
&= \lfloor tm \rfloor_{J \triangleright K} \upharpoonright K \\
&= \lfloor s \rfloor_{J \triangleright K} \upharpoonright K
\end{aligned}$$

Now, we may assume that m is non-initial; so we may write

$$s = tm = t_1 n t_2 m$$

where m is justified by n. We proceed by a case analysis on m.

Case m is an O-move.

1. If $m \in M_J \setminus M_{B_1}$, then $n \in M_J$. Thus,
$$\begin{aligned}
\lceil s \upharpoonright J \rceil_J &= \lceil (t_1 \upharpoonright J).n.(t_2 \upharpoonright J).m \rceil_J \\
&= \lceil t_1 \upharpoonright J \rceil_J.nm \\
&\preceq (\lceil t_1 \rceil_{J \triangleright K} \upharpoonright J).nm \\
&= (\lceil t_1 \rceil_{J \triangleright K}).nm \upharpoonright J \\
&= \lceil t_1 n t_2 m \rceil_{J \triangleright K} \upharpoonright J \\
&= \lceil s \rceil_{J \triangleright K} \upharpoonright J
\end{aligned}$$

and also

$$\begin{aligned}\lfloor s \restriction J \rfloor_J &= \lfloor (t \restriction J).m \rfloor_J \\ &= \lfloor t \restriction J \rfloor_J.m \\ &\preceq (\lfloor t \rfloor_{J \triangleright K} \restriction J).m \\ &= \lfloor t \rfloor_{J \triangleright K}.m \restriction J \\ &= \lfloor tm \rfloor_{J \triangleright K} \restriction J \\ &= \lfloor s \rfloor_{J \triangleright K} \restriction J\end{aligned}$$

2. If $m \in M_K \setminus M_{B_2}$, then $n \in M_K$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}\lceil s \restriction K \rceil_K &= \lceil (t_1 \restriction K).n.(t_2 \restriction K).m \rceil_K \\ &= \lceil t_1 \restriction K \rceil_K.nm \\ &\preceq (\lceil t_1 \rceil_{J \triangleright K} \restriction K).nm \\ &= (\lceil t_1 \rceil_{J \triangleright K}).nm \restriction K \\ &= \lceil t_1 n t_2 m \rceil_{J \triangleright K} \restriction K \\ &= \lceil s \rceil_{J \triangleright K} \restriction K\end{aligned}$$

and also

$$\begin{aligned}\lfloor s \restriction K \rfloor_K &= \lfloor (t \restriction K).m \rfloor_K \\ &= \lfloor t \restriction K \rfloor_K.m \\ &\preceq (\lfloor t \rfloor_{J \triangleright K} \restriction K).m \\ &= \lfloor t \rfloor_{J \triangleright K}.m \restriction K \\ &= \lfloor tm \rfloor_{J \triangleright K} \restriction K \\ &= \lfloor s \rfloor_{J \triangleright K} \restriction K\end{aligned}$$

3. If $m \in M_{B_1} \cup M_{B_2}$, then $n \in M_{B_1} \cup M_{B_2}$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}\lceil s \restriction B_1, B_2 \rceil_{B_1 \multimap B_2} &= \lceil (t \restriction B_1, B_2).m \rceil_{B_1 \multimap B_2} \\ &= \lceil t \restriction B_1, B_2 \rceil_{B_1 \multimap B_2}.m \\ &\preceq (\lfloor t \rfloor_{J \triangleright K} \restriction B_1, B_2).m \text{ (by the inductions hypothesis)} \\ &= \lfloor t \rfloor_{J \triangleright K}.m \restriction B_1, B_2 \\ &= \lfloor tm \rfloor_{J \triangleright K} \restriction B_1, B_2 \\ &= \lfloor s \rfloor_{J \triangleright K} \restriction B_1, B_2\end{aligned}$$

and also

$$\begin{aligned}\lfloor s \restriction B_1, B_2 \rfloor_{B_1 \multimap B_2} &= \lfloor (t_1 \restriction B_1, B_2).n.(t_2 \restriction B_1, B_2).m \rfloor_{B_1 \multimap B_2} \\ &= \lfloor (t_1 \restriction B_1, B_2) \rfloor_{B_1 \multimap B_2}.nm \\ &\preceq (\lceil t_1 \rceil_{J \triangleright K} \restriction B_1, B_2).nm \text{ (by the induction hypothesis)} \\ &= \lceil t_1 \rceil_{J \triangleright K}.nm \restriction B_1, B_2 \\ &= \lceil t_1 n t_2 m \rceil_{J \triangleright K} \restriction B_1, B_2 \\ &= \lceil s \rceil_{J \triangleright K} \restriction B_1, B_2\end{aligned}$$

Case m is a P-move.

1. If $m \in M_J \setminus M_{B_1}$, then $n \in M_J$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
\lfloor s \restriction J \rfloor_J &= \lfloor (t_1 \restriction J).n.(t_2 \restriction J).m \rfloor_J \\
&= \lfloor t_1 \restriction J \rfloor_J.nm \\
&\preceq (\lfloor t_1 \rfloor_{J \triangleright K} \restriction J).nm \\
&= (\lfloor t_1 \rfloor_{J \triangleright K}).nm \restriction J \\
&= \lfloor t_1 n t_2 m \rfloor_{J \triangleright K} \restriction J \\
&= \lfloor s \rfloor_{J \triangleright K} \restriction J
\end{aligned}$$

   and also

$$\begin{aligned}
\lceil s \restriction J \rceil_J &= \lceil (t \restriction J).m \rceil_J \\
&= \lceil t \restriction J \rceil_J.m \\
&\preceq (\lceil t \rceil_{J \triangleright K} \restriction J).m \\
&= \lceil t \rceil_{J \triangleright K}.m \restriction J \\
&= \lceil tm \rceil_{J \triangleright K} \restriction J \\
&= \lceil s \rceil_{J \triangleright K} \restriction J
\end{aligned}$$

2. If $m \in M_K \setminus M_{B_2}$, then $n \in M_K$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
\lfloor s \restriction K \rfloor_K &= \lfloor (t_1 \restriction K).n.(t_2 \restriction K).m \rfloor_K \\
&= \lfloor t_1 \restriction K \rfloor_K.nm \\
&\preceq (\lfloor t_1 \rfloor_{J \triangleright K} \restriction K).nm \\
&= (\lfloor t_1 \rfloor_{J \triangleright K}).nm \restriction K \\
&= \lfloor t_1 n t_2 m \rfloor_{J \triangleright K} \restriction K \\
&= \lfloor s \rfloor_{J \triangleright K} \restriction K
\end{aligned}$$

   and also

$$\begin{aligned}
\lceil s \restriction K \rceil_K &= \lceil (t \restriction K).m \rceil_K \\
&= \lceil t \restriction K \rceil_K.m \\
&\preceq (\lceil t \rceil_{J \triangleright K} \restriction K).m \\
&= \lceil t \rceil_{J \triangleright K}.m \restriction K \\
&= \lceil tm \rceil_{J \triangleright K} \restriction K \\
&= \lceil s \rceil_{J \triangleright K} \restriction K
\end{aligned}$$

□

References

[A+97] Samson Abramsky et al. Semantics of interaction: an introduction to game semantics. *Semantics and Logics of Computation, Publications of the Newton Institute*, pages 1–31, 1997.

[AGM+04] Samson Abramsky, Dan R Ghica, Andrzej S Murawski, C-HL Ong, and Ian DB Stark. Nominal games and full abstraction for the nu-calculus. In *Logic in Computer Science, 2004. Proceedings of the 19th Annual IEEE Symposium on*, pages 150–159. IEEE, 2004.

[AHM98] Samson Abramsky, Kohei Honda, and Guy McCusker. A fully abstract game semantics for general references. In *Logic in Computer Science, 1998. Proceedings. Thirteenth Annual IEEE Symposium on*, pages 334–344. IEEE, 1998.

[AJ94] Samson Abramsky and Radha Jagadeesan. Games and full completeness for multiplicative linear logic. *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 59(02):543–574, 1994.

[AJ05] Samson Abramsky and Radha Jagadeesan. A game semantics for generic polymorphism. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 133(1):3–37, 2005.

[AJM00] Samson Abramsky, Radha Jagadeesan, and Pasquale Malacaria. Full abstraction for PCF. *Information and Computation*, 163(2):409–470, 2000.

[AM97] Samson Abramsky and Guy McCusker. Linearity, sharing and state: a fully abstract game semantics for Idealized Algol with active expressions. In *Algol-like languages*, pages 297–329. Springer, 1997.

[AM98] Samson Abramsky and Guy McCusker. Call-by-value games. In *Computer Science Logic*, pages 1–17. Springer, 1998.

[AM99] Samson Abramsky and Guy McCusker. Full abstraction for Idealized Algol with passive expressions. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 227(1):3–42, 1999.

[BCH14] Marc Bezem, Thierry Coquand, and Simon Huber. A model of type theory in cubical sets. In *19th International Conference on Types for Proofs and Programs (TYPES 2013)*, volume 26, pages 107–128, 2014.

[Bor94] Francis Borceux. Handbook of categorical algebra 1, basic category theory, vol. 50 of encyclopedia of mathematics and its applications, 1994.

[HO00] J Martin E Hyland and C-HL Ong. On full abstraction for PCF: I, II, and III. *Information and computation*, 163(2):285–408, 2000.

[Hug00] Dominic Hughes. *Hypergame semantics: full completeness for system F*. PhD thesis, D. Phil. thesis, Oxford University, 2000.

[HY97] Kohei Honda and Nobuko Yoshida. Game theoretic analysis of call-by-value computation. In *Automata, Languages and Programming*, pages 225–236. Springer, 1997.

[Lai97] James Laird. Full abstraction for functional languages with control. In *Logic in Computer Science, 1997. LICS'97. Proceedings., 12th Annual IEEE Symposium on*, pages 58–67. IEEE, 1997.

[McC98] Guy McCusker. *Games and full abstraction for a functional metalanguage with recursive types*. Springer Science & Business Media, 1998.

[ML84] Per Martin-Löf. *Intuitionistic Type Theory: Notes by Giovanni Sambin of a series of lectures given in Padova, June 1980*. 1984.

[ML98] Per Martin-Löf. An intuitionistic theory of types. *Twenty-five years of constructive type theory*, 36:127–172, 1998.

[Nic94] Hanno Nickau. Hereditarily sequential functionals. In *Logical Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 253–264. Springer, 1994.

[Oua97] Joël Ouaknine. *A Two-Dimensional Extension of Lambekps Categorical Proof Theory*. PhD thesis, McGill University, Montréal, 1997.

[V+13] VA Voevodsky et al. Homotopy type theory: Univalent foundations of mathematics. *Institute for Advanced Study (Princeton), The Univalent Foundations Program*, 2013.